MPRIMATUR,

GUIL. JANE.

Nov. 24. 1677.

(D, (5D), 296 P.
168 + 10 5 cm

MPRIMATUR,

GUIL. JANE.

Nov. 24. 1677.

(D, (5D), 296 P.
168 + 10 5 cm

Mr. *HALES's*

TREATISE OF SCHISM

Examined and Censured.

By *THOMAS LONG*, B. D. and Prebendary of *EXETER*.

To which are Added,

Mr. *BAXTER's*

ARGUMENTS FOR Conformity,

WHEREIN

The most Material Passages OF THE TREATISE of SCHISM ARE *ANSWERED*.

LONDON,
Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at the *Bishop's* Head in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1678.

Mr. HALES's
TRACT
OF
SCHISM
AND
Schismaticks,
(Printed by the Original Copy)
EXAMINED
AND
CENSURED.

Who is it can think to gain acceptance and credit with reasonable Men, by opposing not only the present Church conversing in Earth, but the uniform consent of the Church in all Ages? Mr. *Hales* in his *Miscellanies* set forth by Mr. *Garthwait*, *Anno* 1673. p. 260.

LONDON,
Printed for *Walter Kettilby* at the *Bishop*'s Head in St. *Paul*'s Church-Yard, 1678.

TO THE

Right Reverend Father in GOD

THOMAS

LORD BISHOP OF

EXETER.

IT was propheſied of our Saviour, that *the Government ſhould be upon his ſhoulders*, Iſ. 9. 6. and though he have devolved that burden upon mortal men, which is *Angelicis humeris formidandum*, yet doth he συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι, put under his ſhoulder and help them to bear it, or they would ſoon ſink

under it. For however it fares with the Church, whether it be under perſecution, none are ſo much expoſed to a fiery trial as they; or whether it enjoy peace and plenty. Pride and contention ſwels up ſome corrupt members to the daily vexation of their Heads & Governors. And how blameleſs ſoever their Perſons be, their Office is made a Crime.

Better things might have been expected from the Author of the Treatiſe hereafter conſidered, wherein there is ſo much contempt poured out upon the Epiſcopal Office, and on all Church authority and adminiſtrations, that the Ink is not more black than the Calumny. But where ſhould the *impetus* of diſcontent and faction vent it ſelf, but againſt thoſe rocks that are ſet by God Himſelf to give check and bounds unto it? Now

Now that in the Apoſtles days this ſacred Order was appointed (among other great ends) as a remedy againſt Schiſm, is acknowledged by ſuch as are its reputed Adverſaries: 'In the Church of '*Alexandria* from the time of St. '*Mark* the Evangeliſt they were 'continued as a bulwork againſt 'Schiſm, ſaith St. *Hierom* in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*. 'And in the 'Church of *Corinth*, when Men be-'gun to ſay, *I am of Paul and I of A-'pollo*, this Office was appointed, 'that the ſeeds of Schiſm might be 'taken away, ſaith the ſame Father on the firſt Chap. to *Titus*. And he tells the *Luciferians* in a Dialogue with them, 'That unleſs an emi-'nent and uninterrupted power be 'by all given to the chief Paſtors, 'there will be as many ſchiſms as 'there are Prieſts. In all this St.

Hierom followeth the more ancient Fathers--- *Paſſibus æquis*, for *Ignatius* adviſed the *Trallians* to do nothing without their Biſhop. Which advice he repeating again, tells them: 'It is not my word, but the Word 'of God; and if ye ſuſpect me to 'ſay this, as underſtanding that 'there are Diviſions among you, he 'is my witneſs for whom I am in 'bonds, that it was not man, but the 'Spirit that declared this to me. St. *Clemens* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinth. p.* 57. ſays, 'That the Apo'ſtles foreſeeing that Diviſions 'would ariſe as Chriſt had foretold, 'did eſtabliſh Biſhops. And the 32. Canon of the Apoſtles ordained, 'That if any Presbyter or Dea'conſhould make conventions with'out his Biſhop, he ſhould be de'poſed. In the 4th. Oecumenical Council of *Calcedon* conſiſting of

of 630. Fathers, there was read an Ancient Canon of the Council of *Antioch* to this effect: 'If any 'Presbyter or Deacon contemning 'his Biſhop ſhall ſeparate and erect 'another Altar, and will not obey 'the Biſhop, calling him home 'once and again, we do utterly 'condemn ſuch a one. Which Canon being read by *Aetius* an Arch-Deacon, the Fathers with one conſent proclaimed This is a righteous Canon of the Holy Fathers. In the Second Council of *Carthage* by the Eighth Canon it was provided, 'That if any Preſ-'byter lifted up with pride ſhould 'make a Schiſm againſt his Biſhop, 'let him be accurſed. But in defiance of all theſe Canons and curſes they have been accounted the only bleſſed Men in our times, who have moſt vehemently decry-

ed this holy Order, and ſucceſſfully maintained a Faction againſt them. To whom, if they are yet capable of any Counſel, I would commend the moderation of Mr. *Calvin*, who ſpeaking of Popiſh Biſhops, *Inſtit. l.* 4. *c.* 10. *S.* 6. ſaith, 'If they were true Biſhops, 'I would yield them though not 'ſo much authority as they do re-'quire, yet as much as is requiſite 'for the well-ordering of Eccleſi-'aſtical Government. And what he means by *true Biſhops* he explaineth, *S.* 1. 'The form of the 'Ancient Church ſets before our 'eyes a pattern of the Divine inſti-'tution for the order of governing 'his Church. For though the Bi-'ſhops of thoſe times did ſet forth 'many Canons, in which they 'ſeemed to expreſs more than was 'expreſſed in the Holy Scripture;

yet

'yet they compoſed their whole 'Oeconomy with ſuch caution, ac-'cording to that only rule of God's 'Word, that you may eaſily per-'ceive that they held nothing in 'this reſpect differing from the 'Word of God. And in *S.* 4. he repeats the ſame: *Si rem intuemur, reperiemus veteres Epiſcopos non alium regendæ Eccleſiæ formam voluiſſe fingere ab eâ quam Deus verbo ſuo præſcripſit.* With how much truth and reverence doth this Learned man ſpeak of thoſe ancient Biſhops, of whom he ſays not only that they *did not* actually ſwerve from God's Word as to their Government, but that they *would not.* This Candor is much wanting in ſuch as pretend to be Mr. *Calvin's* Diſciples, with whom this Sacred Function and all its Adminiſtrations are defamed as

Anti-

Antichriſtian and Popiſh, and a Covenant for extirpating them root and branch is ſtill pertinaciouſly adhered to. But though the authority of theſe men be deſpiſed, yet methinks that of our Saviour who hath made them his Ambaſſadors, (and *Apoſtolus cujuſque is eſt quiſque*) and hath told us, *Luke* 10. 16. *He that heareth you, heareth me; he that deſpiſeth you, deſpiſeth me, and he that deſpiſeth me deſpiſeth him that ſent me*] ſhould not be rejected, nor thoſe ſevere penalties under which he exacts our obedience to his Officers be ſlighted. For whoever *will not hear the Church, is to be accounted as a Heathen or Publican*: and *Mark* 6. 11. *Whoſoever ſhall not receive you nor hear you---It ſhall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of Judgment than for them.* And though

though wicked men do ſecurely deſpiſe the cenſures of the Church, yet hath Chriſt ſaid, *Matth.* 18. 18. of his Officers, *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind on Earth ſhall be bound in Heaven*; which authority the Church of God would not have exerciſed in the pureſt and moſt primitive times by ſo many and dreadful Anathema's, if their great Lord had not authorized them, or if they had not experienced the good effects of them. Did the Apoſtle in vain derive a power to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 Epiſt. ch. 5. v. 5. *In the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt to deliver ſuch a one* (as the Inceſtuous perſon) *unto Satan for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of our Lord Jeſus*? Or can we think the Records of the ſeveral Churches in thoſe firſt Ages, which relate

the

the divers painful and languiſhing Diſtempers of Body, as well as the anguiſh and trouble of Mind, which ſeized on ſuch as by the Cenſures of the Church were caſt out of Chriſtian communion into the power of Satan, to be falſe or forged? The Divine Judgments which purſue ſuch as in our times have been deſervedly ejected, or do wilfully depart from the Church-communion, who are for the moſt part given up to a reprobate ſenſe, and being poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of Giddineſs and perverſneſs do as *Cain* run up and down from the Preſence of God in his Publick Worſhip, like Vagabonds from one Faction to another, till they fall into unnatural and diabolical practices, and ſtraying from Chriſt's Fold are made a Prey unto the Devil, do evidently demon-

demonſtrate that the Church-cenſures are not *bruta fulmina*, but have powerful effects for the converſion or confuſion of contumacious offenders.

But *non tali Auxilio*, That Sacred Function which your Lordſhip ſuſtains in our Church needs not ſo weak an Apology as I can make for it. I have only endeavoured (as I was able) to ſilence the reproaches and contradictions of unreaſonable Men, by whoſe ſtrivings the burden of Government, which of it ſelf is weighty enough, is made to ſit more uneaſie on the ſhoulders of our ſpiritual Guides. Againſt whom, it is no difficult work to maintain that aſſertion of Dr. *Hammond* in his anſwer to the Catholick Gentleman, *p.* 134. 'That as long as any particular 'Biſhop remains in due ſubordi-

nation

'nation to his Canonical Superi-
'ors, ſo long the departure of any
'Clergy-man that is under his Ju-
'riſdiction from that obedience
'which canonically he owes to
'him, is in him that is thus guilty
'of it an act of Schiſm. But this
comes not now under conſidera-
tion.

My preſent endeavours I do lay at your Lordſhips feet, as an acknowledgment of that great happineſs which we of your Lordſhips Dioceſs do injoy under your Government; in which, Authority and Meekneſs, Candor and Courage, Piety and Prudence are ſo duly tempered, that though each of them be viſible, yet it is hardly diſcernable which is moſt prevalent. That free and favourable acceſs which your Lordſhip hath vouchſafed me in more pri-

vate

vate concerns, hath incouraged me to this publick Addreſs for the ſervice of the Church, hoping that the Work may find the like gracious acceptance as the *Author* hath: both which, as they really need, ſo they humbly beg your Lordſhips pardon and protection, which will be a ſufficient Sanctuary againſt all Adverſaries of the truths which he defends, and therein of

EXON, New-Years Day, 1677.

Your Lordſhips moſt Humble and Obedient Servant,

THO. LONG.

when all other arguments have failed, to cut the Gordian *knot of our preſent peace and unity in pieces.*

It is my endeavour by the following Exercitations to take this Sword out of the Enemies hands, or at leaſt to blunt the edge of it, and make it unſerviceable to evil deſigns. When I firſt apprehended it, I only let it fall on the Anvil by its own weight, and every one may perceive how it yielded to that gentle Examination: wherefore I was encouraged by a ſeverer cenſure to lay it on the Anvil again, and I hope with a few ſtrokes I have ſo broken it, that there is ſcarce an Artiſt among the Factions can ſo ſolder it, as to make it hurtful or formidable again. I could wiſh they would at laſt turn this and other ſuch Swords into Plow-ſhares, as Men of Evangelical Spirits ought to do, and ſtudy to be quiet, and do their own buſineſs.

But I think it not enough to deprive our Adverſaries of this Weapon, I ſhall attempt to vindicate the fame and reputation of the Venerable Mr. Hales, *of whoſe authority, the Churches adverſaries do often make uſe to the maintenance*

of

of Faction againſt her, as ſometime they did of the King's for raiſing a Rebellion againſt Him.

It is an aggravation of ſorrow, that the Church, like the Eagle, ſhould receive its moſt dangerous wounds by the darts which are feathered from her own wing. And that that learning and piety, which is wanting in the adverſe party, to inforce their own arguments, and ſupport their cauſe, ſhould be ſupplied by the Revolt (as in the Apoſtates to Popery) or the Captivity (as in the caſe of Mr. Hales) *of ſome unſetled and unwary Sons of the Church, of whoſe parts and reputation the Enemies on both ſides have made more advantage than of their own.*

This hath been the beginning and growth of Errors and Schiſmes, when Men of ſubtile parts, and popular eſteem, raiſe doubts and arguments againſt the truth, and inſtill them into weaker judgments, and unſtable minds, who are apt for want of underſtanding to take their Sophiſtry for ſolid reaſoning, and through affection to their Perſons, to adhere to them, as to the moſt faithful guides,

and---jurare in verba magiſtri. *But it is a very prepoſterous method to judge of the cauſe according to the reputation of ſuch as eſpouſe it.* S. *Auguſtine gives us a ſafer rule,* nec cauſa cauſæ, nec perſona perſonæ præjudicet, *Let both cauſes, and perſons, ſtand or fall according to their own merit.*

That little which I can gather concerning Mr. Hales (*all which and a great deal more, I charitably believe he did well deſerve*) *is to this effect compiled by Mr.* Lloid *in his* Memoires p. 606. *In writing of which it ſeems he conſulted the preſent Biſhop of* Cheſter, *and Mr.* Faringdon *his familiar friends.* ‘*Mr.* Hales *was born in* Kent, *and bred* ‘*Fellow of* Merton *College, where he* ‘*was choſen Greek Profeſſor of* Oxford. ‘*Sir* Dudley Carleton *made him his* ‘*Chaplain, when he was at the* Hague, ‘*about the buſineſs of the Synod of* Dort, ‘*whereof* (*being ſent thither to that* ‘*purpoſe*) *he wrote a daily and exact* ‘*account, completed, as appears in his* ‘Remains, *by Dr.* Balcanquel. *At* ‘*which Synod, he hearing* Epiſcopius ‘*well preſſing as he thought that of* ‘*Saint*

'*Saint* John 3. 16. *he ſaid,* There I 'bad *John Calvin* good night. *After* 'this he was *Fellow of* Eaton, *and then* 'Prebendary *of* Windſor, *in the firſt* 'of which places he was *Treaſurer, but* '(*which is ſtrange*) *ſuch was his inte-* 'grity and charity) *to his loſs in point of* 'Eſtate; *And* Fellow (*ſuch his prudence* 'in avoiding the Oaths of the times) 'without any ſnare to his Conſcience. *A* 'perſon of ſo large a capacity, ſo ſharp, 'quick, piercing and ſubtile a wit, of ſo 'ſerene and profound a judgment beyond 'the ordinary reach, built upon unordi- 'nary notions, raiſed out of ſtrange ob- 'ſervations, and comprehenſive thoughts 'within himſelf, and of ſo aſtoniſhing an 'induſtry, that he became the moſt abſo- 'lute maſter of polite various and uni- 'verſal learning, beſides a deep inſight 'into Religion: In the ſearch after which 'he was curious, and of the knowledge 'of it ſtudious, as in the practice of it 'he was ſincere. And as ſtrictly juſt in 'his dealings, ſo he was extraordinarily 'kind, ſweet, affable, communicative, 'humble and meek in converſe, and in- 'imitably as well as unuſually charitable,

'giving away all that he had but his 'choice books, and was forced to ſell them 'at laſt. He was as good a man as he 'was a great Scholar, and as Biſhop 'Pearſon ſaid of him, It was near as 'eaſie a task for any one to become as 'knowing, as ſo obliging. He had ſo 'long and with ſuch advantage and im-'partiality judged of all books, things and 'men, that he was the Oracle conſulted 'by all the learned men of the Nation, 'Dr. Hammond, Mr. Chillingworth, '&c. in caſes that concerned either. 'Whereupon he uſed to ſay of learned mens 'letters, That they ſet up tops, and 'he muſt whip them for them. There 'are no monuments of his learning (ſave 'the great Scholars made by his direcți-'ons and aſſiſtance) extant, but Sir Hen-'ry Savil's Chryſoſtome, which he 'corrected with great paines in his 'younger dayes, and illuſtrated with 'admirable notes, (for which he is often 'honourably mentioned by Mr. Andrew 'Downs Greek Profeſſor of Cam-'bridge) and a Collection of ſome choice 'Sermons and Letters made by Mr. Gar-'thwait. He was very tender of judg-

'ing

'ing any but himſelf, and never ſpake 'with complacency of any of his own works, 'but his Sermon intitled Dixi, Cuſto-'diam, on Pſalm 36. 1. (And indeed had he been as good at the Cuſtodiam, as he was at the Dixi, he had been an incomparable man.) For Biſhop Pearſon 'in his Preface to his Remains ſaith, 'He was a man of as great ſharpneſs, 'quickneſs and ſubtilty of wit, as ever 'this, or perhaps any Nation bred. His 'Induſtry did ſtrive if it were poſſible to 'equal the largeneſs of his capacity. Pro-'portionable to his reading was his medi-'tation, which furniſhed him with a 'judgment beyond the vulgar reach of 'man. So that he really was a moſt pro-'digious example, of an acute and piercing 'wit, of a vaſt and illimited knowledge, 'of a ſevere and profound judgment. Al-'though this may ſeem, as in it ſelf it 'truly is, a grand Eulogium, yet I can-'not eſteem him leſs in any thing which 'belongs to a good man, than in thoſe 'intellectual perfections. And had he 'never underſtood a Letter, he had other 'ornaments ſufficient to endear him. As 'a Chriſtian, none ever more acquainted

with the nature of the Gospel, because none more studious of the knowledge of it, or more curious in the search: which being strengthned by those great advantages before mentioned, could not prove otherwise than highly effectual. He took indeed to himself a liberty of judging not of others but for himself. And if ever any man might be allowed in these matters to judge, it was he who had so long, so much, so advantagiously considered, and which is more, never could be said to have the least worldly design in his determinations. He was not only most truly and strictly just in his secular transactions, most exemplary, meek and humble notwithstanding his perfections, but beyond all example charitable, giving unto all, preserving nothing but his books to continue his learning, and himself; which when he had before digested, he was forced at last to feed upon; at the same time the happiest and most unfortunate Helluo *of books, the grand* Exemplar *of learning, and of the envy and contempt which followeth it. None was more solicited to write, and thereby to teach the world, than*

'than he; yet none more reſolved againſt 'it: yet did he not hide his Talent, being 'ſo communicative, that his Chamber 'was a Church and his Chair a Pulpit. So far Biſhop Pearſon, *who teſtifieth alſo, that of all the Sermons, Miſcellanies,* &c. *then publiſhed for his, we may be confident they were his.*

And now you ſee the reaſon, why Mr. Hales (*the famed Author of ſuch a work*) *was ſo highly eſteemed by the Brethren of the Factions, as that ſuch, of either the Presbyterian or Independent faction, as defended their diviſions and ſeparations, made him their* Coryphæus; *he being for parts and learning, head and ſhoulders above the talleſt of them. The Treatiſe was printed, as I find, in an unhappy time,* Anno 1642. *and although I am of the mind, that by the weakneſs of the Arguments, the Author intended rather to betray than defend the Schiſm, yet the Separatiſts wanting better reaſons, made a great noiſe with theſe, as if they were juſtified in their Schiſm by this work, notwithſtanding the demerits of their own.*

The

The fame of this and ſome other Opinions of our Author came to the cognizance of that great Lover of learning, and learned men, Arch-biſhop Laud, *who ſent for him on purpoſe to admoniſh him of his faults; and he being come to the Palace in the morning, the Arch-biſhop preſently gives order to delay Dinner, (probably that he might have the more time for diſcourſe with* Mr. Hales) *and taking him to his Garden with him, they continued their conference for ſome hours; after which they were very good friends, the Arch-biſhop ſtudying to prefer him, and he praying for the Arch-biſhop as his Chaplain. And whereas he had been heard to ſay in his former days, that he thought he ſhould never dye a Martyr, yet he was known to live a Confeſſor, and if we will believe* Mr. Marvel, *he dyed little leſs than a Martyr for the Doctrine and Diſcipline of the Church of* England, *being by the enemies thereof deprived of all his livelihood, and reduced to ſuch extremities as did contribute to the ſhortning of his days.*

Dr.

Dr. Heylen *in the Life of the Arch-Biſhop, tells us of another Book, called* Diſquiſitio brevis, *aſcribed to Mr.* Hales, *in which ſome of the principal* Socinian *Tenents were cunningly inſerted, pretending them for the beſt expedients to appeaſe ſome controverſies between us and* Rome. *And that the Treatiſe of Schiſm not then Printed, was tranſmitted from hand to hand in written Copies, intended chiefly for the incouragement of our great Maſters of wit and reaſon to deſpiſe the Authority of the Church, the diſperſing of which gave the Arch-Biſhop occaſion to ſend for him to* Lambeth. *And that the Arch-biſhop knew his abilities while he lived in* Oxon. *For (Dr.* Heylen *ſays) he was a man of infinite reading and no leſs ingenuity, free of diſcourſe, and as communicative of his knowledge as the celeſtial bodies of their light and influences. And that after the diſcourſe above intimated, which continued from Nine of the Clock till the uſual time of Dining, was paſt, and the Lord* Conway, *and other Perſons of Honor being there, ſome of the Servants thought it neceſſary to give him*

notice

notice how the time had paſſed away; and then coming in high coloured and almoſt panting for want of breath, enough to ſhew there had been ſome heats between them, Mr. Hales *met with* Dr. Heylen, *with whom he was acquainted, told him that he found the Arch-biſhop (whom he knew before to be a nimble Diſputant) to be as well verſed in Books as buſineſs; That he had been ferreted by him from one hole to another, till there was none left to afford him further ſhelter; That he was now reſolved to be* Orthodox, *and to declare himſelf a true Son of the Church of* England *both for Doctrine and Diſcipline,* p. 361, 362.

† *If it be demanded why our Author did not refute this Tract in his life-time; I anſwer* 1. *he did do it as effectually as the Philoſopher confuted him that denied motion, when he aroſe from his ſeat, and walked up and down before him; for his long profeſſion, and practice, contrary to what was there written, was* Proteſtatio contraria facto. 2. *The Tract carried its confutation with it, as appears in the examination.* 3. *It's not impoſſible*

ſible that he foreſaw how it might be ſerviceable to the Royal Party, whom their adverſaries had begun to revile and perſecute as Arminians *and* Papiſts: *and in ſome caſes, poyſon well tempered and rightly applied may become medicinal.* 4. *He might be confident ſuch weak arguments as he made uſe of, though they might pleaſe the factious multitude who knew no better, yet they could do no great hurt among Judicious men. And becauſe we cannot gueſs at the Author's aim, which is ſecret, we ought to judge by his actions which were publick. The learned Biſhop* Taylor *made uſe of a like Stratagem to break the Presbyterian power, and to countenance Diviſions between the Factions, which were too much united againſt the Loyal Clergy: for in his Liberty of Propheſying, he inſiſts on the ſame Topicks of Schiſm and Hereſie, of the incompetency of Councils and Fathers to determine our Eccleſiaſtical controverſies, and of ſcrupulous Conſciences, and urgeth far more cogent arguments than our Author did, but ſtill he had prepared his* Σοφὸν Φάρμακον, *an Antidote to prevent any dangerous effect of his diſcourſe.*

Not

Not unlike to some Mountebanks (Pardon the Comparison) who to amuse the vulgar, and to effect their own ends do administer to their Merry-Andrews *a certain Dose of Poison, but immediately give them such an Antidote as causeth them to cast it up again, and hinders the mischievous operation of it. For the Judicious Reader may perceive such a reserve (though it lay in Ambuscado, and be compacted in a narrow compass) as may easily rout those Troops, which began too soon to cry* Victoria, *and thought of nothing else but dividing the Spoil. And if the learned Bishop did this and was blameless, the goodness of the End in such cases denominating the Action, I see no cause why our Author, whose ends (as we ought in charity to believe, considering the integrity of the Person) were for the restoring of peace, seeing he represented the causes of War so frivolous and inconsiderable, ought to be represented as a Criminal or adversary.*

And thus I have endeavoured to rescue the Author's Person, as well as his Papers from the Enemies tents, according to the advise

advice of Tully *in the case of* Muræna, Tolle Catonem de Causâ, *that by any means he should take off* Cato *from appearing as an Enemy, or an Evidence against him, lest the Opinion of* Cato's *vertues should create him more prejudice, than the strength of his Arguments were like to do.*

I have only to acquaint the Reader that the reason why in the following Censure I have sometime named the Author as distinct from Mr. Hales, *is because I believe it is applied by too many to such intents as the Author never thought of; and as the Epigrammatist saith of ill repeating, so shall I say of ill applying other mens books,*

----Malè dum recitas, incipit esse tuus.

I cannot certainly calculate the time when this Tract of Schism was first penned, but I suppose it to be about Forty Years since, it being quoted by Mr. Chillingworth *in his Answer to* Knott, *which wants but little of that age. And unless my conjecture, and*

credible

credible information do both fail me, the occasion on which it was written was this: Mr. Hales and Mr. Chillingworth were of intimate acquaintance, and beside a constant correspondence by Letters they had frequent converse with each other, but more especially when Mr. Chillingworth came so far in his Answer as to Vindicate our Church from Schism which was charged on her by Knott, He consulted with Mr. Hales concerning the nature of Schism, and after discourse he desired Mr. Hales to write his thoughts about it, which he did in this Tract, out of which Mr. Chillingworth urged some arguments, which I think are the worst in all his Book. Sure I am that they caused ill reflections not only on the private reputation of Mr. Hales and Mr. Chillingworth, but on the Church of England, as if that did favour the Socinian Principles. The Author of Infidelity Unmasked writing against Mr. Chillingworth, tells him that his arguments concerning Schism were conceits borrowed from a Letter of Mr. John Hales of Eaton written

to

to a private Friend of his (as I am credibly informed, ſaith that Author, by a Perſon well known to them both at that time, and who ſaw the Letter it ſelf.) And he farther affirms, of his own certain knowledge, that Mr. Hales *was of a very inconſtant judgment, One Year (for Example ſays he) doubting of, or denying the bleſſed Trinity, and the next Year profeſſing and adoring the ſame. And another Perſon, in a Pamphlet called the* Total Summ, *written againſt Mr.* Chillingworth, *reviles him on the ſame account in theſe words. In this you ſhew the Adamantinal hardneſs of your* Socinian *forehead and* Samoſatenian *Conſcience. The truth is, that ſome arguments borrowed from the* Socinians, *and urged firſt by Mr.* Hales, *and from him by Mr.* Chillingworth, *gave occaſion to that imputation. But as for Mr.* Chillingworth *he had ſufficiently ſecured his reputation in the Preface of his Book, where he thus profeſſeth: I believe the Doctrine of the Trinity, the Deity of our Saviour, and all other*

Supernatural verities received in the Scripture, as truly and as heartily as any man. And whereas he dyed in the Faith of the Church of England, *he hath given aſſurance that he was then no* Socinian. *As for* Mr. Hales, *whatever he was when he wrote this Tract of Schiſm, and ſome others, yet as his Adverſary ſays, he did afterward profeſs and adore the bleſſed Trinity. And for the Reader's ſatisfaction, as well as for* Mr. Hales *his Vindication, I ſhall tranſcribe that account which he gives of his Faith concerning the Trinity in his* Golden Remains.

Mr. *HALES*'s Confeſſion of the TRINITY.

The Summ of whatever either the Scriptures teach, or the Schools conclude concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, is compriſed in theſe few Lines.

GOD is One, numerically one, more one than any ſingle Man is one, if

if Unity could *ſuſcipere magis & minus*: yet God is ſo One, that he admits of diſtinction, and ſo admits of diſtinction that he ſtill retains Unity. As he is One, ſo we call him GOD, the Deity, the Divine Nature, and other Names of the ſame ſignification; as he is diſtinguiſhed, ſo we call him Trinity, Perſons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. In this Trinity there is One Eſſence, Two Emanations, Three Perſons or Relations, Four Properties, Five Notions. (A Notion is that by which any Perſon is known or ſignified.) The One Eſſence is GOD, which with this relation, that it doth generate or beget, makes the Perſon of the Father; The ſame Eſſence with this Relation, that it is begotten, makes the Perſon of the Son; The ſame Eſſence with this relation, that it proceedeth, maketh the Perſon of the Holy Ghoſt. The Two Emanations are, to be begotten, and to proceed, or to be breathed out. The Four Properties are; *Firſt*, Innaſcibility and In-

emanability; the *second* is to generate, these belong to the Father; the *third* is to be begotten, this belongs to the Son; the *fourth* is to proceed, or to be breathed out, this belongs to the Holy Spirit. The *five* Notions are, *first*, Innascibility; the *second* is to beget; the *third* is to be begotten; the fourth *Spiratio passiva*, to be breathed out; the *fifth Spiratio activa*, or to breath; and this Notion belongs to the Father and the Son alike; for *Pater & filius spirant Spiritum sanctum.* Hence it evidently follows, that he who acknowledgeth thus much, can never possibly scruple the Eternal Deity of the Son of God. *And then he ingenuously concludes:* If any Man think this Confession to be defective (for I can conceive no more in this point necessary to be known) let him supply what he conceives deficient, and I shall thank him for his labour.

But to proceed: The confutation of this Treatise of Schism will appear to

be neceſſary not only to wipe off the aſperſions of the Papiſts, but to ſilence the Objections of Factious Perſons, who often take Arguments from it to defend themſelves in their ſeparation, as will appear by that which followeth.

Mr. Hales *had ſaid*, p. 207. "*That* "*the Church might be in any number* "*more or leſs, in any place, Country* "*or Nation, it may be in all, and for* "*ought I know it may be in none,* "*without prejudice to the Definition of* "*the Church, or the truth of the Go-*"*ſpel. This ſtrange notion is contrary to what Mr.* Hales *delivers in his* Golden Remains, p. 260. "*When we* "*appeal* (*ſaith he*) *to the Churches* "*Teſtimony, we content not our ſelves* "*with any part of the Church actually* "*exiſtent, but add unto it the perpe-*"*tually ſucceſſive teſtimony of the Church* "*in all Ages ſince the Apoſtles time. And*, p. 186. "*This ſucceſſion of the* "*Church is ſufficient to prove where our* "*Church was before* Luther. *This ſtrange notion I ſay, That the Church*

viſible may totally decay, prevailed too far with Mr. Chillingworth, *who ſaith, p.* 239. It is not certain that the truth of the Article [*of the Holy Catholick Church*] depends upon the Actual exiſtence of a Catholick Church, but rather upon the right that the Church of Chriſt, or rather, to ſpeak properly, that the Goſpel of Chriſt hath to be univerſally believed; and therefore the Article may be true though there were no Church in the World. *Now though this were only a probleme, which Mr.* Chillingworth *defends not, but in the* 14. p. *of his Preface overthroweth, ſaying,* I believe that our Saviour ever ſince his Aſcenſion hath had in ſome place or other a viſible true Church on Earth, and that there will be ſuch a Church to the Worlds end: *yet his Adverſary, p.* 779. *of* Infidelity Unmasked, *falls heavily on him, and tells him, that this notion is not only againſt the Scripture,* Eph. 4. 11. *but againſt all Proteſtants and all Chriſtians; and ſends him to* Calvin's Inſti-

Inſtitutions, *l.* 4. *c.* 1. *and to* Volkelius, *whom he calls his Socinian Brother*, de verâ Rel. *l.* 6. *c.* 5. *who prove a Succeſſion of Paſtors and Doctors to have been always in the Church.* Remanſit Doctorum Paſtorúmque officium, nec non alia quædam. *And indeed Dr.* Potter, *whom Mr.* Chillingworth *defended, had ſaid truly,* That it was an error in the nature, and matter of it properly Heretical to ſay, the Church remained only in the party of *Donatus*, and that it was much worſe to ſay ſhe remained no where; for this were to overthrow the Article of the Catholick Church, *and is little leſs than blaſphemy, ſaith Arch-biſhop* Laud.

Again, Mr. Hales, *p.* 218. *ſaid,* "*It is alike unlawful to make profeſſion of known or ſuſpected falſhoods, as to put in practice unlawful or ſuſpected actions. This argument Mr.* Chillingworth *improveth,* p. penult. *of his Preface to* Charity maintained. If a Church (*ſays he*) ſuppoſed to

want nothing neceſſary, require me to profeſs againſt my Conſcience, that I believe ſome error though never ſo ſmall and innocent, *which I do not believe*, and will not allow me her communion but upon this condition; in this caſe the Church for requiring this condition is Schiſmatical, and not I for ſeparating from the Church. *Mr.* Baxter *ſpeaks much more like a Conformiſt in this caſe, than either Mr.* Hales, *or Mr.* Chillingworth: If a Church (*ſaith he, p.* 464. *of* Reaſons for Chriſt. Relig. S. 15.) which in all other reſpects is pureſt and beſt, will impoſe any ſin upon all that will have any local communion with it, though we muſt not ſeparate from that Church as no Church, yet muſt we not commit that ſin, but patiently ſuffer them to exclude us from their communion. *And I think it is more rational peaceably to diſſent until we are actually excluded, than preſently to pronounce that Church Schiſmatical, which requires ſuch conditions of our com-*

communion. For if that which I believe to be an error, (being, if an error, but ſmall and innocent) be required of me by a Church which maintaineth all neceſſary things, I ought rather to ſubmit to, or at leaſt peaceably with-hold my communion from that Church, than to violate its communion by my ſeparation; becauſe that Church which GOD hath preſerved in all neceſſary truths, may probably know that which I believe to be an error (and but a ſmall one, if an error) to be an important truth; or if ſhe be miſtaken in ſuch ſmall things, it is not ſchiſmatical in her to require my profeſſion, who may well be reſolved of my doubt, when ſo many wiſer and better than my ſelf after mature deliberation think fit to require it.

For as Mr. Hooker *ſaith*, p. 100. In all right and equity that which the Church hath ſo long received and held for good, that which publick approbation hath ratified, muſt carry the benefit of preſumption with

with it to be accounted meet and convenient. *And, p.* 55. This O-
† pinion, That the Authority of Man affirmatively in matters Divine is nothing worth, being once inſerted into the minds of the vulgar ſort, GOD knows what it may grow unto. Thus much we ſee, It hath already made Thouſands ſo head-ſtrong, even in groſs and palpable Errors, that a Man whoſe capacity will ſcarce ſerve him to utter five words in ſenſible manner, bluſheth not in any doubt concerning matter of Scripture, to think his own bare Yea as good as the Nay of all the Wiſe, Grave and Learned Judgments that are in the whole World; which inſolency muſt be repreſt, or it will be the very bane of Chriſtian Religion. *And therefore he concludes:* The certain commands of the Church muſt be obeyed in all things not certainly unlawful. *And page* 144. That which the Church by her Authority ſhall probably think and define to be true and good, muſt

must in congruity of reason over-rule all other inferior judgments whatsoever. And as to Orders established (by the Church) sith equity and reason favour that which is in being till orderly judgment of Decision be given against it, it is but Justice to Exact of you, and perverseness in you it would be to deny thereunto your willing obedience. Not that I judge it a thing allowable for Men to observe those Laws which in their hearts they are stedfastly perswaded to be against the Laws of God; but your perswasion in this case ye are all bound for the time to suspend, and in otherwise doing ye offend against GOD by troubling his Church without any just or necessary cause. Be it that there are some Reasons inducing you to think hardly of our Laws, are those Reasons demonstrative, are they necessary, or but meer probabilities only? An argument necessary and demonstrative is such, as being proposed unto any Man and understood,

ſtood, the mind cannot chooſe but inwardly aſſent. ------ But if the skilfulleſt among you can ſhew that all the Books ye have hitherto written be able to afford any one Argument of this nature, let the inſtance be given. As for probabilities, what thing was there ever ſet down ſo agreeable with ſound reaſon, but ſome probable ſhew againſt it might be made? Is it meet that when publickly things are received and have taken place, general obedience thereunto ſhall ceaſe to be exacted, in caſe this or that private perſon, led with ſome probable conceit, ſhould make open proteſtation, *Peter* or *John* diſallow them, and pronounce them naught? ------ So that of peace and quietneſs there is not any way poſſible, unleſs the probable voice of every intire Society or Body Politick over rule all private of like nature in the ſame Body. Which thing effectually proveth, that GOD being Author of Peace and not of confuſion in the Church,

muſt

muſt needs be Author of thoſe Mens peaceable reſolutions, who concerning theſe things have determined with themſelves to think and do as the Church they are of Decreeth, till they ſee *Neceſſary cauſe* enforcing them to the contrary. *And p.* 144, 145. *Mr.* Hooker *ſaith*, That which the Church by her Authority ſhall probably think and define to be true and good, muſt in congruity of reaſon over-rule all other inferior judgments whatſoever. *And*--where our duty is Submiſſion, weak oppoſitions betoken Pride.

Now as the Name of Mr. Hales *prevailed with Mr.* Chillingworth *to imbrace ſome unſound Opinions of his, ſo hath it done with others of great note. The Author of the* Irenicum, *p.* 108. *repeats the firſt and part of the ſecond Page of this Tract, with this Commendation:* It is well obſerved by a Learned and Judicious Divine, *That Hereſie and Schiſm, &c. And p.* 120. I ſhall ſubjoyn the judgment

of

of as Learned and Judicious a Divine as moſt our Nation hath bred in his Excellent though little Tract of Schiſm. *And then he repeats, p.* 210. *In theſe Schiſms, &c. to p.* 212. *And in p.* 120, *and* 121. *of the* Irenicum, *he quotes* Mr. Hales, *from p.* 215. *And were Liturgies, &c. to p.* 218. *and adds,* So far that Excellent Perſon, whoſe words I have taken the pains to tranſcribe becauſe of the great wiſdome, judgment and moderation contained in them, and the ſeaſonableneſs of his Counſel and Advice to the preſent poſture of Affairs among us. *And p.* 394. Thus that incomparable Man, *Mr. Hales,* in his often quoted Tract of Schiſm, *p.* 223. *to p.* 225. *adding,* Thus that grave and wiſe Perſon, whoſe words ſavour of a more than ordinary tincture of a true ſpirit of Chriſtianity, that ſcorns to make Religion a footſtool to pride and ambition.

The Author of the Rehearſal Tranſpros'd, *ſpeaks marvellouſly of Him:*

I

I ſhall conclude (*ſays he.*) with a Villanous Pamphlet, of which a great Wit was the Author; and whereas *Mr. Bayes* is alwayes defying the Non-conformiſts with *Mr. Hooker's Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, and *the Friendly Debate*, I am of Opinion, though I have a great reverence for *Mr. Hooker*, that this little Book of not full Eight Leaves hath ſhut that *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, and *Mr. Bayes* too out of Doors: It is one *Mr. Hales* of *Eaton*, a moſt Learned Divine, and one of the Church of *England*, and moſt remarkable for his ſufferings in the late times, and for his Chriſtian patience under them. And I reckon it not one of the leaſt ignominies of that Age, that ſo eminent a Perſon ſhould have been by the iniquity of the times reduced to thoſe neceſſities, under which he lived. And account it no ſmall honour to have grown up into ſome part of his acquaintance, and converſed a while with the living Remains of one of the cleareſt Heads and beſt prepa-

red

red Breasts in Christendom. I hope it will not be tedious though I write some few (and yet whatsoever I omit I shall have left behind more) material passages. (*And then he fills up near Eight Pages of his Book, out of Mr.* Hales *his Eight Leaves.*)—— *It was not amiss in the Scribes and Pharisees to build the Tombes of the Prophets, and garnish their Sepulchres; but to persecute their Successors, and Christ himself under pretence of honouring the Ancients, was an impiety, full fraught with malice and envy. And a usual thing it is for such as intend to trample on such Worthies as are present and stand in their way, to express great respect to those that are removed out of it:*

—— Sed nisi quæ terris semota suisque
Temporibus defuncta videt, fastidit & odit.

Yet by that Author's leave I have quoted much less out of the Reverend Mr. Hooker *in this* Parergon *yet enough*

to

to confute all that he or Mr. Hales have said in Defence of Schism.

There is another late Pamphlet called Separation no Schism, *which in p.* 40. *telleth us*, That a meer suspicion of sin is a sufficient ground for withdrawing Communion, in the judgment of very learned Men; *and then quotes* Mr. Hales——So says that Universally admired Man, *p.* 210. *and p.* 216, 217, 218. *and infers*, These Testimonies are so clear, and backt with such Unanswerable Reasons, that not only where the Communion of Sin, but the doing any thing that is suspected to be sinful, is required as a condition of Communion, there a withdrawing is lawful, and not at all Schismatical.

Now when Men of so much Learning and Judgment, as some of those whom I have mentioned, have upon the reputation of the Venerable Mr. Hales *improved such Notions and Arguments as are destructive to the Government*

and Peace of the Church of England, it is not strange that Men of little Learning and great Prejudices should assume them, whereby (as far as they are able) to justifie their Schismatical practices; nor that the Serpents of this Age should be fond of such Nurseries as may tend to the Subversion of what hath been so long, and so well established among us. We may rather wonder, how so Virulent a Pamphlet (as the Rehearsal calls it; yet) so obnoxious to just exceptions, should have continued so long in Vogue without a Confutation from some more Learned Hand, that the Imposture of it might proceed no farther, but its weakness be made manifest to all Men.

As for Doctor Parker, he hath no less judiciously and successfully acquitted Himself against any thing objected by Master Hales, or Marvel, than Master Hooker. To instance in that one particular, of pretending Scruples of Conscience against the Commands of Publick Authority; he saith more

in

in One Page, than all the Objectors will be able to Answer. "Though "this pretence (saith he) might be "allowed of in the Dayes of Queen "Elizabeth, when it was first Start-"ed, yet after so long time, and so "much enquiry, it is intolerable. For "if after all their search and exami-"nation they have not been able to "descry the evils they suspected, this "is a sufficient Principle of Presump-"tion that their Jealousies are un-"grounded: so that if they are now "able to object any certain crime a-"gainst them, then this Plea of a "Doubtful Conscience ceaseth, and the "Certainty is to be pleaded in stead of "the Doubt; if not, an Hundred and "Fifty Years is a sufficient time to sa-"tisfie or to cancel scruples,..... And "a scrupulous Conscience is of a mo-"dest, yielding, and pliable temper, "arising from a diffidence and di-"strust of it self. And Doubts and "Scruples are rarely employed, but up-"on trifling and inconsiderable mat-"ters, the material parts of Duty

" being too plain and easie to be liable
" to so much uncertainty; And there-
" fore obedience to Authority, being one
" of the greatest and most indispensa-
" ble Duties of Mankind, in that it
" is so absolutely necessary to their well
" being, and injoyned upon them by
" the most Positive Precepts and seve-
" rest Penalties of the Gospel:

" Nor is it fit that in Doubtful ca-
" ses of a Publick concern Men should
" talk too peremptorily of their pri-
" vate Perswasions, because they are
" incompetent Judges of the Publick
" good, and therefore are to be deter-
" mined and over-ruled by the Judg-
" ment of those to whose care the ma-
" nagement of Publick Affairs is in-
" trusted, unless in case of certain
" and unquestionable Disobedience to
" the Law of GOD: For we are
" no otherway free from the Su-
" preme Authority on Earth, but as
" we are subject to a Superior in
" Heaven.

AN EXAMINATION OF *Mr. HALES's* TREATISE of SCHISM.

Q. WHat is the benefit of Communion?

Answ. Communion is the ſtrength and ground of all ſociety, Sacred and Civil: whoever therefore cauſeth a breach, if in civil occaſions, is guilty of Sedition, or Rebellion; if in Eccleſiaſtical differences, is guilty of Schiſm: ſo that Schiſm is an Eccleſiaſtical Sedition, as Sedition is a Lay-ſchiſme, *p.* 193.

Q. What is the definition of Schiſm?

Anſw. Schiſme is an unneceſſary ſe-
p. 195. paration of Chriſtians, from that part of the viſible Church of which they were once Members.

Q. When is Separation neceſſary?

Anſw. Separation is then neceſſary, when nothing will ſave us from the guilt of Conſcience, but open ſeparation, *p.* 195.

Q. When is Schiſme complete?

Anſw. Theſe two things make Schiſm complete. *Firſt*, The choice of a Biſhop in oppoſition to the former. *2ly*, The erecting a new Church and Ora-
p. 196. tory, for the dividing Party to meet in publickly. As in the late famous controverſie in *Holland*, *de Prædeſtinatione*, as long as the diſagreeing Parties went no further than diſputes, the Schiſme was unhatched; but as ſoon as one Party ſwept an old Cloyſter, and by a pretty Art ſuddenly made it a Church (by putting a new Pulpit in it) for the ſeparating Party to meet in, what before was a Controverſie became a formal Schiſme, *p.* 197.

Q. What is the danger of Schiſm?

Anſw.

Anſw. What the Ancients ſpake by way of cenſure of *Schiſme* in general, is moſt true, (and they ſpake moſt ſtrange things of it) for they ſaw, that unadviſedly, and upon fancy, to break the knot of union betwixt man and man (eſpecially among Chriſtians, upon whom the tye of love and communion doth eſpecially reſt) was a crime *hardly pardonable*, and that nothing abſolves a Man from the guilt of it, but true and unpretended Conſcience. And *p.* 192. Hereſie and *Schiſme* are things of great moment, the one offending againſt Truth, the other againſt Charity, and both are deadly. p. 198.

Q. Was the *Schiſme* of the *Donatiſts* any way excuſable?

Anſw. No, they were compleat Schiſmaticks, upon the grounds before mentioned, nor was there any neceſſary cauſe for their Separation, for the occaſion of the *Schiſme* was an Opinion, that where good and bad were mixed, there could be no Church, by reaſon of pollution evaporating (as it were) from ſinners, which blaſted the righteous, and made all unclean, whereas p. 196. p. 205.

in his Congregations, he pretended that wicked persons found no shelter, *p.* 206.

Q. How was this *Schisme* of the *Donatists* refuted?

Answ. By this one maxime of *Saint Augustine* (which was irrefragably asserted) *Unitatem Ecclesiæ per totum orbem dispersæ propter nonnullorum peccata non esse deserendam*, That the unity of the Catholick Church is not to be forsaken, for the sins of some that are within it, *p.* 206.

p. 208. *Q.* Though in this *Schism* the *Donatist* was the *Schismatick*, yet might not any one communicate with them, if occasion so required? if so be they did not flatter them in their *Schisme*; for why might it not be lawful to go to Church with the *Donatist*, if occasion so required, since neither Nature, nor Religion suggest the contrary? why p. 209. may I not be present at such publick Meetings as pretend Holiness, so there be nothing done but what true Devo- p. 215. tion and Piety brook? Yea, why may I not go to an *Arian* Church, if occasion require, so there be no *Arianism* expressed in the Liturgy? *Answ.*

Anſw. 1. You may not communicate with ſuch, becauſe of the danger of *Schiſme* before mentioned. 2*ly*, Becauſe it is not lawful, no not for prayer, hearing, conference, or any other religious office whatſoever, for People to Aſſemble, otherwiſe than by publick order is allowed; for, why ſhould Men deſire to do that ſuſpiciouſly, in private, which may be performed warrantably in publick? *p.* 229, 230.

2. But what if they to whoſe care the execution of the publick ſervice is committed, do ſome things unſeemly, ſuſpicious, or unlawful? if their Garments be cenſured as, or indeed be ſuperſtitious? what if the Geſture of Adoration be uſed at the Altar? what if the Homiliſt or Preacher deliver any Doctrine, of the truth of which we are not well perſwaded? p. 209.

Anſw. Yet for all this, we may not ſeparate, except we be conſtrained to bear a part in them our ſelves: The Prieſts under *Eli* had ſo ill demeaned themſelves about the daily *Sacrifice*, that they made itto ſtink, yet the People refuſed notto come to the Ta- p. 210.

bernacle, nor to bring their Sacrifices to the Priests; for in Schismes which concern fact, nothing can be a just cause of refusal of Communion, but only the requiring of the execution of some unlawful or suspected Act.

Q. What may we do when some Persons in a Church teach erroneous
p. 214. Doctrines, suppose of *Arius* and *Nestorius*, concerning the Trinity, or the Person of our Saviour?

Answ. What to do in this case is not
p. 215. a point of any great depth of understanding to discover, so be it distemper and partiality do not intervene. I do not see, that *Opinionum varietas & Opinantium unitas* are ἀσύμφωνα, or that Men of different Opinions in Christian Religion, may not hold communion (*in Sacris*) in the publick Worship: (This Argument holds, *à fortiori*, if I may keep communion with such as teach false Doctrines, much more with such as practise only suspected Ceremonies.) *p.* 226.

Q. What is your Opinion of Conventicles?

Answ. It evidently appears that all Meetings

Meetings upon unneceſſary occaſions of Separation, are to be ſo ſtiled; ſo that in this ſenſe a Conventicle is nothing elſe but a Congregation of Schiſmaticks. p. 227.

Q. Is not this name ſometime fixed upon good and honeſt Meetings? *p.* 227.

Anſw. It is, and that perchance, not without good reaſon; For *firſt*, it hath been at all times confeſſed neceſſary, that God ſhould have, not only inward and private devotion, when Men either in their Hearts, or Cloſets, or within their private Walls, pray, praiſe, confeſs, and acknowledge: but that all theſe things ſhould be done in publick, by troops and ſhoals of Men, from whence proceeded publick Temples, Altars, Forms of Service, appointed Times, and the like, which are required for open Aſſemblies. p. 227.

Q. What is the reaſon of the ſevere Cenſures and Laws againſt private Meetings?

Anſw. When it was eſpied that ill affected perſons abuſed private Meetings, whether religious, or civil, to evil ends, religiouſneſs to groſs impiety p. 228.

ety (and the Meetings of Chriſtians under *Pagan* Princes, when for fear they durſt not come together in open view, were charged with foul imputations, as by the report of Chriſtians themſelves it plainly appears: as alſo civil Meetings under pretence of Friendſhip, and neighbourly viſits, ſheltered treaſonable attempts againſt
p.229. *Princes*, and Common-weals) Hence both Church and State joyned, and joyntly gave order for forms, times, places of publick Concourſe, whether for civil or religious ends; and all other Meetings whatſoever beſides thoſe, of which both time and place were limited, they cenſured for routs, and riots, and unlawful Aſſemblies in the State, and in the Church, for Conventicles.

Q. Is it not lawful then, for Prayer, hearing, conference, and other religi-
p.229. ous Offices, for People to Aſſemble, otherwiſe than by publick Order is allowed?

Anſw. No; for why ſhould Men deſire to do that ſuſpiciouſly in private, which warrantably may be performed in publick? *p.*230. *Q.*

Q. I pray you Sir, What general Rules are fit to be obſerved for the diſcovering and avoiding of Schiſme.

Anſw. Take heed of entertaining ſcruples of Conſcience, about things of little moment; for when ſcruples of Conſcience began to be made, or pretended, then Schiſmes began to break in, *p.* 217.

Q. What other Rule is neceſſary to be obſerved?

Anſw. That you do not endeavour to advance one Biſhop againſt another, (much more a Presbyter againſt the Biſhop) which in *St. Cyprian*'s language, is *Erigere Altare contra Altare*, to ſet up Altar againſt Altar, to which he imputeth the Original of all Church diſorders, and if you read him, you would think he thought no other Church-tumult to be a Schiſme, but this; For the general practice of the Church, was, never to admit more than one Biſhop at once in one See, but it fell out among the Ancients, ſometime by occaſion of difference in Opinion, ſometimes becauſe of difference among thoſe who were intereſſed in the

p. 222.

p. 221.

the choice of Biſhops, that two Biſhops, and ſometime more were ſet up, and all Parties ſtriving to maintain their own Biſhop, made themſelves ſeveral Congregations and Churches, each re-
P. 223. fuſing to participate with others. And ſeeing it is a thing very convenient for the peace of the Church, to have but one Biſhop in a See, at once; Their puniſhment ſleeps not, who unneceſſarily or wantonly go about to infringe it.

Having

HAving by a brief *Analyſis* of the Treatiſe of Schiſm extracted the genuine ſenſe of the Author, who, as the *Tranſproſer* ſays, *p.* 175. was one of the Church of *England*, (and as ſuch I have endeavoured to repreſent him) it is obvious to every one that ſhall read that Tract, that inſtead of Anſwering Mr. *Hooker*'s or Mr. *Parker*'s Tracts of Eccleſiaſtical Polity, it hath fully refuted it ſelf and all other cavils of the Schiſmaticks, who by theſe two aſſertions of his will for ever lye under a juſt condemnation. The One is, *p.* 209. *What if thoſe to whoſe care the Execution of the publick ſervice is committed, do ſomathing either unſeemly or ſuſpicious, or peradventure unlawful? what if the Garments they wear be cenſured as, nay indeed be Superſtitious? what if the geſture of Adoration be uſed at the Altar? what if the Homiliſt or Preacher delivar any doctrine, of the truth of which we be not well perſwaded? yet for all this we may not ſeparate, except we be conſtrained perſonally to bear*

a part in them our ſelves—— Then may not any of the Laity who are not required to bear a part in ſuch things, ſeparate from our Congregations, and by conſequence neither may their Leaders draw them into a ſeparation.

The ſecond Aſſertion is, *p.* 229.-- *It is not lawful, no not for prayer, for hearing, for conference, for any other religious office whatſoever, for people to aſſemble, otherwiſe than by publick order is allowed.* This concluſion our Author infers from ſubſtantial premiſes.

I confeſs I was ſo tender of the reputation and memory of Mr. *Hales*, who, as the *Tranſproſer* ſays, was not only one of the Church of *England*, but moſt remarkable for his ſufferings in the late times, and for his Chriſtian patience under them, which befel him, as Mr. *Parker* obſerves, *p.* 148. "when "he had declared himſelf of another "Opinion, and obtained leave of "Arch-biſhop *Laud* (who converted "him) to call himſelf his Grace's "Chaplain, that naming him in his "publick prayers, the greater notice "might

"might be taken of the Alteration: (which doubtleſs was the cauſe why ſo eminent a perſon was by the iniquity of thoſe times reduced to thoſe neceſſities under which (the *Tranſpoſer* obſerves) he lived, *p.* 176.) that I reſolved at firſt not to make any reflection on ſuch paſſages as diſcovered the Author to be guilty of ſo many Paſſions, infirmities and contradictions. I ſhall not deal therefore with Mr. *Hales* in this poſthumous piece, but with that *inimicus homo*, whoever he be, that hath ſown tares among the good ſeed, and wrapt up poyſon in his *Golden Remains*. And neceſſary it is that ſuch noxious and unſavory weeds ſhould be rooted out, and not ſuffered to defile the grave of ſo Candid a perſon, or made uſe of as a ſhelter for unclean creatures to hide themſelves and croak under them, as the *Tranſproſer* doth, who having raked a heap of them together, from *p.* 175. to *p.* 183. fancieth himſelf as ſecure on that dunghil, as if he were in ſome inchanted Caſtle.

The

The *first* thing that is obnoxious in the Treatise of Schism, is *p.* 191. of the Posthumous works, where it is said, that "Heresie and Schism, as "they are in common use, are two "Theological Mormo's or Scarcrows: And what the Author means by *common use*, you may be informed, *p.* 213. where he says, "Arrianism, Eutychianism, Nestorianism, Photinianism, Sabellianism, and many more "(you may add Socinianism too, "which is but a compound of those) "are but names of Schism, howsoever in the common Language of "the Fathers they were called heresies. So that our Author explodes the Judgment of all the Fathers who condemned those things for Heresies, which he thinks do scarce deserve the name of Schisms. And a new notion of Heresies is brought in by him, *p.* 214. "Indeed Manicheism, Valentinianism, "Marcionism, Mahometanism are "truly and properly heresies, for we "know that the Authors of them received them not but minted them "themselves, and so knew that which "they

" they taught to be a lye; but can
" any man avouch (ſaith our Author)
" that *Arrius* and *Neſtorius*, and others
" that taught erroneouſly concerning
" the Trinity, or the perſon of our Sa-
" viour, did malicioufly invent what
" they taught, and not rather fall
" upon it by error and miſtake? Till
" that be done, and that upon good
" evidence, we will think no worſe
" of all parties than needs we muſt,
" and take theſe Rents in the Church
" to be but Schiſms upon matter of
" Opinion. If this be true, in vain
did the Biſhops of the Primitive
Church aſſemble in the Councils of
Nice, *Epheſus*, and other places, to
condemn and ſuppreſs the Opinions of
Arrius, *Neſtorius* and other Hereſiar-
cha's. And the fears and jealouſies
of the preſent Church concerning the
growth of hereſies are groundleſs; for
though the erring ſpirits of this age
ſhould revive all the dangerous tenets
of *Arrius*, *Eutychius*, *Neſtorius*, *Pho-
tinus*, and *Sabellius*, and all the blaſ-
phemies of *Manes*, *Valentinian*, *Mar-
cion*, or *Mahomet* himſelf, yet ſeeing
they

they did not invent these errors themselves, but fell on them by mistake (though they adhere to them never so tenaciously, and wilfully defend them) they deserve but the name of Schismaticks. And until some such persons, as *Simon Magus*, *Montanus*, or *Mahomet* shall set up for a new God, or a Holy Ghost, or a Messias, in direct opposition to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, we need not trouble the world with the odious names of Heretick, or Schismatick, which are but Theological Scarcrows. For *p.* 215. we are told "that the Rents "in the Church (occasioned by those "heresies) were at the worst but "Schisms upon matter of Opinion. "In which case (saith our Author) "it is not a point of any great depth "of Understanding to discover what "we are to do, so be it distemper and "partiality do not intervene; I do not "yet see that *opinionum varietas & "Opinantium unitas* are ἀσύμφωνα or "that men of different Opinions in "Christian Religion may not hold "communion *in Sacris*, and if oc-

"casion

'caſion require I may go to an Arrian 'Church, if there be no Arrianiſm ex- 'preſt in their Liturgy.

This is expreſly contrary to what I quoted from *p.* 229. 'It is not lawful 'for prayer, hearing, &c. and as contrary to the Holy Scriptures, *Rom.* 16. 17. *Titus* 3. 10. *Epheſ.* 5. 11.

What error and confuſion would theſe wilde notions bring into the Church, if falſe Prophets and Deceivers ſhould be permitted to teach, and the People not reſtrained from hearing them, although they ſhould teach ſuch damnable Doctrines as denyed the Lord that bought them? I ſhall appeal therefore from the Author to Mr. *Hales*; who tells us, *p.* 192. "However Hereſie and Schiſm are but ridiculous terms in the common ma- "nage, yet the things in themſelves "are of very conſiderable moment, "the one offending againſt truth, the "other againſt Charity, and therefore "both deadly. So deadly, that I cannot compare them better than to that *Italian*, who deſigned to kill his enemy, body and ſoul: for Truth being

the very Soul of the Church, and Peace and Unity the great organ or inſtrument by which it becomes viſible and proſperous, the toleration of Hereſie and Schiſm will be as deſtructive to the Church here, as they will certainly be to the Authors of them without repentance hereafter.

There is a leſſer miſtake in our Author's definition of Schiſm, *p.* 195. by which he excuſeth all ſuch from the guilt of Schiſm, " as do ſeparate from " that part of the viſible Church " whereof they were not once mem- " bers. On which account all ſuch children as were born of Schiſmatical Parents (though they defend the ſchiſm never ſo obſtinately) are not guilty: whereas it is the duty of all Chriſtians to live in communion with that part of the Catholick Church in which they reſide, and not to ſuffer themſelves (as our Author expreſſeth it) like beaſts of burthen to be impoſed upon by their Predeceſſors. The Schiſm of the *Donatiſts* is by our Author acknowledged to be a complete Schiſm upon the grounds mentioned *p.* 156.

p. 196. I demand therefore, whether ſuch children, as were born to the *Donatiſts*,* and perſiſting in the opinions and practices of their Fore-fathers troubled the Churches of *Africa* 300. years together, were guilty of Schiſm or no? or whether ſuch as among us were born of Anabaptiſtical or Quaking Parents, and ſtill perſiſt in and propagate Church-diviſions, are complete Schiſmaticks or not? And if we ſhould try them by our Author's own rules, I am ſure they will be found guilty.

* Optatus lib. 1. contra Parmen. ſays, ~ Parmenianus whoſe grandfather was Majorinus, that departed from the Chair of Cecilian & S. Cyprian, was an heir of the Schiſmaticks.

The next error of our Author is his allowing of Separation upon Scruples, and ſuſpicions, as *p.* 194. he ſays, 'When either Acts unlawful, or mi-'niſtring juſt Scruple, are required of 'us to be performed, conſent were con-'ſpiracy, and open conteſtation is not 'faction or ſchiſm, but due Chriſtian 'animoſity. This juſt Scruple he calls, *p.* 201. *a ſtrong ſuſpicion*, and *p.* 218. 'Where ſuſpected Opinions are made 'a piece of the Church-Liturgy, he 'that ſeparates is not the Schiſmatick. It is like our Author forgat what he ſaid a little before, *p.* 217. 'that when

'Scruples of conſcience began to be 'made or pretended, then Schiſms be-'gan to break in; as alſo what is ſaid, p. 209. 'What if the Preacher deliver 'any Doctrine of the truth of which 'we are not well perſwaded? yet for 'all this we may not ſeparate, except 'we be conſtrained perſonally to bear 'a part in ſome ſuſpected Act. Againſt this error of our Authors I affirm, That the Scruples and ſuſpicions of private Chriſtians, concerning the lawfulneſs of Actions required by their Superiors, cannot warrant their ſeparation, Becauſe their obedience to Superiors in things not unlawful is their duty, and to omit a certain duty, upon a bare ſuſpicion, is dangerous and ſinful. And for a full anſwer to this error, I deſire it may be conſidered what a ſcrupulous Conſcience is, which I take to be ſuch an act of the practical underſtanding as reſolves what is, or what is not to be done, but with ſome fear and anxiety leſt its determination be amiſs. And it differs from a doubting Conſcience, which aſſents to neither part of the queſtion, but remains unreſolved,

as

as doubting of the true ſenſe of the rule; in which caſe it is reſolved, that in all things doubtful we are to take the ſafeſt courſe. And doubtleſs that wherein the generality of wiſe and good Men as well Ancient as Modern are agreed, is much more ſafe than that, in which a few leſs knowing, prejudicated and guilty perſons pretend to be doubtful. But where there are only groundleſs fears and ſcruples concerning ſome circumſtance annexed to a known duty, it is the ſenſe even of our Non-conformiſts, That if we cannot upon ſerious endeavours get rid of our Scruples, we ought to act againſt them; And this is ſo lawful and neceſſary, that we cannot otherwiſe have either grace or peace. See more to this purpoſe in a Sermon at *Cripplegate* on *Acts* 24. 26. *p.* 18, *&* 19. And if ſcruple and ſuſpicion were a juſt plea for Separation, then every diſcontented Perſon that is reſolved to contemn his Superiors, every one that is affectedly ignorant, and lazy, or refractory to better information, every one that hath melancholy humours and temp-

tations, or wants true Christian Humility, or Charity, may make separation, and yet be guiltless. So that this Opinion of our Author's would be an Apology for all Separatists; which being allowed, there neither was nor can be any such sin as Schism. For I suppose it is sufficiently known, that neither the Doctrine, or Worship of any Church is so well constituted, but some unquiet spirits have raised scruples and suspicions concerning them. And unless the Church have power to command things lawful and no way repugnant to the Word of God (though some giddy Persons may scruple at them) it is impossible that it should preserve it self from confusion. The Apostles I am sure did practise this in the Synod at *Hierusalem*, *Acts* 15. And St. *Paul* silenceth the objections of contentious and scrupulous Persons with the *Custome of the Churches of God*, 1 *Corinth.* 11. 16. Every Congregation that pretends to have the face of a Church requires the obedience of its Members to all Orders for publick Worship, as well as their consent to

their

their Articles of Faith, and without this it could not ſubſiſt.

I ſhall conclude this with Mr. *Baxter's* advice in his *Diſpute of Ceremonies*, Ch. 15. S. 3. 'That the Duty of obeying being certain, and the ſinfulneſs 'of the thing commanded being uncertain and only *Suſpected*, we muſt 'go on the ſurer ſide. And the Author of the Sermon on *Acts* 24. 16. gives a good reaſon for it, ſaying, 'If a Chriſtian ſhould forbear praying or receiving the Sacrament every time his 'ſcrupulous conſcience tells him he 'had better wholly omit the duty, than 'perform it in ſuch a manner, he would 'ſoon find to his ſorrow the miſchief 'of his ſcruples. And he adviſeth---- 'In all known neceſſary duties always 'do what you can, when you cannot 'do what you would.

Our Author, *p.* 202. falls on an Ancient controverſie concerning the obſervation of *Eaſter*, of which he gives us this imperfect account, "That it "being upon error taken for neceſſary, "that an *Eaſter* muſt be kept, and

" upon worſe than Error (if I may " ſo ſpeak) for it was no leſs than a " point of Judaiſm forced upon the " Church) thought further neceſſary " that the ground for the keeping the " time of that Feaſt muſt be the rule " left by *Moſes* to the *Jews*, there " aroſe a ſtout queſtion whether we " ought to Celebrate with the *Jews* on " the 14*th*. of the Moon, or the *Sun-* " *day* following. This matter though " moſt unneceſſary, moſt vain, yet " cauſed as great a combuſtion as ever " was in the Church, the Weſt ſepa- " rating from and refuſing Commu- " nion with the Eaſt for many years " together.

An impartial relation of the ground of this controverſie as it lies in Church Hiſtory will ſufficiently diſcover how odiouſly it is repreſented. Firſt then, whereas he ſays, it was upon error taken for neceſſary that an *Eaſter* muſt be kept: I anſwer, if it were an error, the Church had it from the Apoſtles themſelves; for although the contending parties differed among themſelves in the day, yet both agreed

on

on the neceſſity of obſerving *Eaſter* in Commemoration of our Saviour's Reſurrection: And the Controverſie concerning the day puts it out of controverſie that there ought to be a day obſerved. Some learned men have thought the ſetting a-part of an *Eaſter* day to be grounded on 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. where S. *Paul* ſpeaking of the Chriſtian Paſſover, ſays, *Let us keep the Feaſt*; and *Grotius* obſerves that the word ἑορτάζωμεν anſwereth to the Hebrew, חגג, which ſignifieth to abſtain from all work for the offering up of holy things to God. If the obſervation of any day be neceſſary unto Chriſtians, this of *Eaſter* is, becauſe it is the Mother and ground of our weekly Sabbath, and is ſuppoſed to be the ſame which S. *John* calls the Lords day, *Rev.* 1. 10. But we need not ſeek expreſs authority from Scripture to make it neceſſary; the practice of the Apoſtles teſtified by ſuch early and authentick witneſſes, and the continued celebration of it in all the Churches of God do evince that it was not taken up on an Error, no more than

" upon worſe than Error (if I may " ſo ſpeak) for it was no leſs than a " point of Judaiſm forced upon the " Church) thought further neceſſary " that the ground for the keeping the " time of that Feaſt muſt be the rule " left by *Moſes* to the *Jews*, there " aroſe a ſtout queſtion whether we " ought to Celebrate with the *Jews* on " the 14*th*. of the Moon, or the *Sun-* " *day* following. This matter though " moſt unneceſſary, moſt vain, yet " cauſed as great a combuſtion as ever " was in the Church, the Weſt ſepa- " rating from and refuſing Commu- " nion with the Eaſt for many years " together.

An impartial relation of the ground of this controverſie as it lies in Church Hiſtory will ſufficiently diſcover how odiouſly it is repreſented. Firſt then, whereas he ſays, it was upon error taken for neceſſary that an *Eaſter* muſt be kept: I anſwer, if it were an error, the Church had it from the Apoſtles themſelves; for although the contending parties differed among themſelves in the day, yet both agreed

on

on the neceſſity of obſerving *Eaſter* in Commemoration of our Saviour's Reſurrection: And the Controverſie concerning the day puts it out of controverſie that there ought to be a day obſerved. Some learned men have thought the ſetting a-part of an *Eaſter* day to be grounded on 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. where S. *Paul* ſpeaking of the Chriſtian Paſſover, ſays, *Let us keep the Feaſt*; and *Grotius* obſerves that the word ἑορτάζωμεν anſwereth to the Hebrew, חגג, which ſignifieth to abſtain from all work for the offering up of holy things to God. If the obſervation of any day be neceſſary unto Chriſtians, this of *Eaſter* is, becauſe it is the Mother and ground of our weekly Sabbath, and is ſuppoſed to be the ſame which S. *John* calls the Lords day, *Rev.* 1. 10. But we need not ſeek expreſs authority from Scripture to make it neceſſary; the practice of the Apoſtles teſtified by ſuch early and authentick witneſſes, and the continued celebration of it in all the Churches of God do evince that it was not taken up on an Error, no more than

than the obſervation of the Weekly Sabbath. Mr. *Hales* ſays enough to reſolve this objection in his *Golden Remains* ſet forth by Mr. *Garthwait* 1673. *p.* 260. on the queſtion, how we may know the Scriptures to be the word of God. 'When (ſaith he) we appeal 'to the Churches teſtimony, we con-'tent not our ſelves with any part of 'the Church actually exiſtent, but add 'unto it the perpetually ſucceſſive 'teſtimony of the Church in all Ages 'ſince the Apoſtles times (*viz.*) ſince 'its firſt beginning, and out of both 'theſe draw an argument in this que-'ſtion, of that force as that from it 'not the ſubtileſt Diſputer can find 'an eſcape. For who is it that can 'think to find acceptance and credit 'with reaſonable men by oppoſing not 'only the preſent Church converſing in 'earth, but the uniform conſent of the 'Church in all ages?---- So that the Church in all Ages agreeing that an *Eaſter* muſt be kept, it was not taken up upon Error.

Nor, ſecondly, was it upon worſe than error, (*i. e.*) as our Author affirms,

firms, 'a point of Judaiſm grounded 'on the Law of *Moſes* to the *Jews*, that 'the obſervation thereof was by ſome 'Churches ſolemnized on the 14*th*. day 'of the Moon. For the Eaſtern Churches alledging the practice of S. *John* and *Philip* for the 14*th*. day, had a better ground for it than a Jewiſh cuſtom, namely that of Chriſtian Charity; and *Baronius* notes it as worthy of our obſervation, that the Apoſtles had anciently appointed, that though *Eaſter* were obſerved on the Lords day by the generality of Chriſtians, yet they ſhould gently tolerate the Judaizing Converts, which were of the circumciſion, and were in great numbers in the Eaſtern parts. See *Baronius*'s Annals *ad Ann*. 167. *p*. 168. Now the Weſtern Churches pleaded for their practice (which was the obſervation of the Sunday following) the Authority of S. *Peter*, and S. *Paul*, who had fully convinced the Gentile converts, that all Jewiſh rites were to be laid aſide, as having had their full completion in Chriſt; but yet, as in other like caſes, they were inſtructed

ſtructed to bear with the *Jews*, as for ſome time they did; for the firſt time that this controverſie was agitated was between *Anicetus* Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smyrna* who according to the cuſtom of other *Aſian* Churches celebrated *Eaſter* day on the 14*th*. of the Moon.

For which practice *Polycarp* alledged the Authority of S. *John*. And *Irenæus* in an Epiſtle mentioned by *Euſebius l.* 5. *c.* 18. tells us, that *Polycarp* came to *Rome* to diſcourſe with *Anicetus* concerning this and other different obſervations between the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches; and having after ſome conference amicably agreed other controverſies, they ſtill differed about this obſervation, but without any violation of the bond of Charity, for they communicated together, *Anicetus* giving leave to *Polycarp* to perform the offices of Divine Worſhip in his Church; and it was then concluded, That both Churches ſhould be at liberty to obſerve the Ancient cuſtomes delivered to them from their Predeceſſors. But about the year

of

of Chriſt, 198. *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* revives the controverſie with *Polycrates* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, who was then 65 years old and came within a little time of *S. John*, being cotemporary with *Polycarp*. *Victor* pleads that the cuſtom of his Church was derived from the Apoſtles *S. Peter* and *S. Paul*, and that all his Predeceſſors had celebrated *Eaſter* on the Lords day. See *Euſebius lib. 5. ch. 21, 22, 23.* And *Nicephorus l. 4. c. 36. Polycrates* in his Epiſtle mentioned by *Euſebius, l. 5. c. 24.* replies, That all the Provinces of *Aſia* obſerved it according to an Ancient tradition received long before (*i. e.* before the ſecond Century) from *S. John* and *S. Philip*, from *Polycarp* Biſhop of *Smyrna*, from *Thraſeas* Biſhop of *Eumenia*, *Sagaris* of *Laodicea*, *Papirius* and *Melito* Biſhops of *Sardis*, who always practiſed according to the ſame Canon, and all the Biſhops of *Aſia* then living conſented to and ſubſcribed his Epiſtle. Upon this, *Victor* beginneth to ſtorm, and threatneth to Excommunicate the Biſhops of *Aſia* as Heterodox, and to

that

that end he assembleth the Bishops under his Jurisdiction, who with one consent declared for peace, desiring his forbearance, and disliking his too great severity. The Epistle of *Irenæus* to *Victor* on this occasion is yet extant, in which he declares, That although for his part he was resolved to observe the Feast of *Easter* on the *Sunday* according to the practice of the Western Church in which he lived, yet he could not approve that the Eastern Church should be Excommunicated for observing an Ancient custom; and mindeth *Victor* that the Bishops before him had never broken the Churches peace on this occasion. But no mediation would prevail; *Victor* was *Victor* still, and proceeds to denounce an impotent sentence against the *Asian* Churches. *Baronius* says something to excuse the severity of *Victor* (*viz.*) That as long as those Churches were Catholick and incorrupt, they of *Rome* thought it expedient to tolerate that custom; but when from that custom, Schism and Heresie brake in upon the *Asian* Churches,

ches, (for *Montanus* having diffuſed his Hereſie through *Aſia*, thoſe Aſians began to plead that they had received this Tradition from their Paraclete, that the *Paſcha* ought to be celebrated on the 14*th*. of the Moon and on no other day, and that all ſuch as practiſed otherwiſe were in an error) then *Victor* thought it his duty to reſtrain this error. 2. This Opinion of keeping *Eaſter* after the Aſian manner was taken up by many Hereticks, and ſo ſpread it ſelf that it invaded the very boſom of the Roman Church, and pluckt thence one *Blaſtus* who in the face of that Church maintained the Aſian againſt the Roman Cuſtom. *Tertullian* ſpeaks of this *Blaſtus* in his book *de Præſcriptionibus*, c. 53. ſaying, that he endeavoured to bring in Judaiſm, affirming that the Chriſtian *Paſcha* was not to be kept otherwiſe than was preſcribed by the Law of *Moſes*. And this opinion of *Blaſtus* drew away ſo many after him, that *Irenæus* wrote a book of *Schiſm* directed purpoſely againſt *Blaſtus*, but could not recal him. And now let Tit. 1. 10, 11.

the

the indifferent Reader judge whether the ſubject of this controverſie were *moſt unneceſſary, moſt vain* (as our Author declaims.) *Victor* indeed did proſecute it with too much heat, inſomuch that the Cardinal knows not what to ſay in his excuſe. *An verò quod poteſtate, jure faciebat, rectène fecerit dubitatum eſt*, ſaith the Cardinal. Doubtleſs the Aſian Churches were (*ſui juris*) not under the juriſdiction of *Victor*, or if they had been, yet was he not unblameable in Excommunicating all the Churches of *Aſia* for the fault of ſome few that had crept in among them, whom in due time they would have reſtrained by their own authority. He was alſo too precipitate in not yielding to the mediation of his own Biſhops in behalf of thoſe Churches. And laſtly, he was much more culpable for impoſing this obſervation on the Aſian Churches as a matter of Faith, and judged them to be heterodox and excommunicate that would not ſubmit. *Baronius* his words *ad annum Chriſti* 198. *p.* 191. of the *Antwerp* edition are,

are, *Totius Aſiæ Eccleſiæ cum aliis finitimis tanquam alterius fidei & opinionis à communi unitate Eccleſiæ amputare conatur.* Nor were the Aſian Churches without fault for yielding ſo long to a Jewiſh Ceremony, which might long ere that time have been decently buried as other Jewiſh cuſtomes had been: And alſo for ſuffering ſome among them to teach a neceſſity of obſerving the Chriſtian *Paſcha* on the 14*th.* day and no other. So that (to conclude) though the Roman Church was in this particular ſtronger in the Faith, yet (as our Author ſaith) they ſhould have born with the imbecillity of their weaker Brethren, a thing which (he obſerves) *S. Paul* would not refuſe to do, *p.* 218. To which I ſay, that *S. Paul* did comply for a while with the Jewiſh Converts in the Caſe of Circumciſion, but when ſome of them pleaded for a neceſſity of Circumciſion, he thunders againſt that Opinion as loudly as *Victor* did againſt this, ſaying, That *if they were Circumciſed* (*i.e.* with an Opinion of the neceſſity of it) *Chriſt ſhould profit them nothing*, *Gal.* 5. 2.

Now from this Hiſtory (as our Author had contrived it) he drew ſeveral wilde inferences: As *firſt*, *p.* 203. 'In 'this fantaſtical Hurry I cannot ſee '(ſaith he) but all the World were 'Schiſmaticks. To which I reply. That all the World were not concerned in it, there being ſome Nations that diſfered from both theſe in the obſervation of *Eaſter*, as *Socrates*, *l.* 5. *c.* 21. hath obſerved: for even among the *Jewiſh* Converts, ſome that agreed on the 14*th.* day differed in the Moon, and Venerable *Bede* obſerves that our Nation (which the *Pope* pretends to have been his Converts) did in thoſe primitive times obſerve their *Eaſter* on the 14*th.* day (which by the way is an argument that we at firſt received the Chriſtian Faith, not from the Church of *Rome* who exploded this cuſtome, but more Anciently from *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or from St. *Philip*, who, as many good Authors affirm, planted the Chriſtian Religion in our neighbour Nation of *France*, and as the *Aſian* Churches affirm, was one of them that taught them this cuſtom)

nor

nor do we read that they were condemned for Hereticks for ſo doing. Neither did thoſe Eaſtern Churches who differed in the Moneth anathematize each other; and *Socrates* (*ubi ſupra*) gives this reaſon for it, They that agree in the ſame Faith may differ from each other in reſpect of Rites. (as the Reformed Churches do at this day) And though the *Roman* Church did excommunicate the *Aſian*, yet were they never the more Schiſmaticks for that, being they were (*ſui Juris*) not under the *Roman* power. And according to our Authors definition of ſchiſm, they being never members of that Church from which they were excommunicate, could not be guilty of ſchiſm notwithſtanding *Victors* rigor. We ſay therefore they were ſtill members of the Catholick Church. And as for the *Roman* Church what ſhould make them Schiſmaticks? For though *Victor* did arrogate too much as to the manner of his proceedings, yet as to the matter, his proſecution againſt a *Jewiſh* ceremony when it grew into an Opinion of being neceſſary to be obſerved,

ſerved, was his duty, and approved
Gal. 5. 2. by the practice of St. *Paul* himſelf. And while there was a controverſie between their Governors, the People and Clergy too of both Parties continued in due ſubjection to their Superiors, and in mutual charity to one another. So that the Separatiſts of our Age can have no excuſe for their Schiſm from this inſtance.

But our Author infers, *Secondly*, 'that this fell out through the ignorance or *(which he mentioneth alſo)* the 'malice of their Governors, and that 'through the juſt judgment of God on 'the People, becauſe through ſloth and 'blind obedience they examined not 'the things which they were taught, 'but like beaſts of burthen patiently 'couched down and indifferently underwent whatſoever their Superiors 'laid upon them. To which I Anſwer. It doth not appear there was any charge of ignorance to be imputed to *Victor*, or his People, for the reaſons above mentioned; much leſs of malice. Our preſent Sectaries do call their oppoſition to Ceremonies (more innocent

cent than that) by the name of zeal, and love to the cauſe of God. Nor was there any thing impoſed on the Churches of either ſide, that concerned their Faith, nor any cuſtome or rite (*de novo*) but only the *Aſian* Churches were deſired to tranſlate the cuſtome of obſerving *Eaſter*, from a day which gave offence not only to the Church of *Rome*, but ſeveral other Churches. *Petavius* ſays, the difference was not *de Catholico dogmate, ſed de Ritu, ſeu Ritûs potiùs tempore.* And if the Superiors in the *Aſian* Churches had thought the Alteration fit, (as ſhortly after they did) it had doubtleſs been the Peoples duty to ſubmit; for every Church hath power in thoſe things which are indifferent, and much more in ſuch things as give offence to other Churches, to appoint and alter rites and ceremonies for the publick Worſhip of God; and the People ſhew themſelves not beaſts of burthen but Chriſt's Free-men, in ſubmitting to their Governors as far as Chriſtian liberty doth permit. If *Victor* had impoſed new Articles of Faith, as *Pius*

Quintus did in the Council of *Trent*, doubtleſs thoſe Primitive Chriſtians would have reſiſted even to bloud; of which they gave too many inſtances when they conſtantly endured all manner of torments rather than they would renounce the Faith once delivered to them.

Our Author therefore needed to ask pardon for wounding the reputation of theſe Ancient Worthies in cool bloud, as well as for maſſacring at once the authority of all the Fathers in the heat of a temptation, *p.* 204. where he ſays thus: 'You may plainly ſee 'the danger of our appeal to Antiqui-'ty for reſolution in controverſies of 'Faith, and how ſmall relief we are 'to expect from thence; for if the 'diſcretion of the chiefeſt Guides of 'the Church did in a point ſo trivial, 'ſo inconſiderable, ſo mainly fail them, 'as not to ſee the truth in a ſubject 'wherein it is the greateſt marvel, how 'they could avoid the ſight of it; Can 'we without the imputation of ex-'treme grosneſs and folly, think ſo 'poor ſpirited perſons competent Judg-

'es

'es of the queſtions now on foot in the 'Churches? Pardon me, I know not 'what temptation drew that note from 'me. To this I reply: 1. Whoever he be that ſo contemptuouſly rejects the Authority, and trampleth on the reputation of the Fathers, hath ſufficiently excuſed thoſe that ſhall ſlight his own. This is the Author's own ſenſe, *Golden Remains, p.* 260. 2. I refer it to the judgment of the Reader whether *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome* condemning ſome of the *Aſian* Churches for adhering too tenaciouſly to a *Jewiſh* ceremony which was of ill conſequence to thoſe and other neighbouring Churches, were not more excuſable than a private perſon, living many hundred years after the fact, (and never rightly knowing, or elſe wrongfully repreſenting it) inſolently and cauſleſly condemning the Ancient Fathers, not of one or two Ages or parts of the Church, but all in general; as if the failing of one man in a point ſo trivial and inconſiderable (as our Author calls it) were ſufficient reaſon to condemn them all for indiſcreet and poor ſpiri-

ted perſons; And to impute extreme groſsneſs and folly to all that ſhould think them competent Judges of our differences. This is a τέρας beyond that of *Abailardus*, who was wont to ſay, that the Fathers for the moſt part did think this or that to be right, but I think otherwiſe, as if his ſingle authority could out-weigh all theirs. 3. He muſt pretend to have ſome new light for his guide, and be either an Enthuſiaſt, or Socinian, that can ſee any danger in appealing to Antiquity for reſolution in controverted points of Faith. For ſeeing there is ſcarce any point of Faith but ſome unhappy Wits have controverted it, and in defence of their Opinions have put the Scriptures on the rack to make them ſpeak their own ſenſe; how can points of Faith delivered in the Scriptures be better underſtood and confirmed than by the joynt conſent of ſuch Ancient Doctors who converſed with the Apoſtles or their immediate Succeſſors, and are rightly called *Apoſtolici*, many of which were Perſons of great Learning and Eloquence, and ſo could not

be

be charged with ignorance? And doubtleſs they were very induſtrious in inquiring into the grounds of the Chriſtian Faith, for which they forſook all temporal accommodations, and moſt of them their lives, and againſt all oppoſition have not only handed down to us the Scriptures themſelves pure and incorrupt, but the proper and genuine ſenſe of them. We do not make them *Judices* but *Indices fidei*, not the Authors but the witneſſes to confirm and give evidence in matters of Faith. 4. The Papiſts do calumniate the Reformed Divines as if they rejected the judgment of the Fathers; whereas they do with one conſent (and none more readily than they of the Church of *England*) appeal to their Authority for confirmation of the Faith which they profeſs. I could eaſily fill a Volume with the teſtimonies of our Modern Divines concerning the authority of the Ancients, how competent Judges they are of the queſtions now on foot. The naming of ſome few will reſolve us whether our Author's Opinion or theirs deſerves the

the imputation of groſneſs and folly. *Calvin* in his controverſie with *Pighius, de libero Arbitrio*, ſays, The controverſie between me and *Pighius* would ſoon be ended if he would declare the tradition of the Church in the certain and perpetual conſent of the Holy and Orthodox. *Bucer* ſays as much on *Matth.* 1. concerning the conſent of the Church about the perpetual Virginity of the Holy Virgin *Mary*. That to doubt of that conſent, unleſs ſome plain Oracle of Scripture doth inforce it, is not the part of them that have learned what the Church of Chriſt is. When *Zanchy* was 70. Years old, and had long ſtudied the point, He tells us in theſe words: *Hoc ego ingenuè profiteor talem eſſe meam conſcientiam, ut à veterum Patrum ſive dogmatibus, ſive ſcripturarum interpretationibus, non facilè niſi manifeſtis ſcripturarum teſtimoniis vel neceſſariis conſequentiis apertiſque demonſtrationibus convictus atque coactus diſcedere queam; ſic enim acquieſcat mea conſcientia, & in hac mentis quiete cupio etiam mori. Epiſtola ad Confeſſ. fidei,*

fidei, *p.* 47. *Gualter* in his Preface to *Peter Martyr*'s common places, ſays, From hence come all kinds of evils, the peſt of diſputatiouſneſs, the violation of all bonds of Charity, and ſhaking the fundamentals of Faith, becauſe we do not reverence the Ancients as much as we ought. Nor fear I to affirm, that the chief cauſe of the Contentions of our Age, is, becauſe moſt Divines inſiſt on the Opinions of their preſent Maſters, and read their Books, not enquiring what learned Antiquity did think, or what errors and hereſies were condemned by it. As for the Divines of our own Church, it may be ſufficient to mention Biſhop *Jewel*'s Chalengee, and how well he diſcharged it. 'If any 'learned man of our adverſaries (ſaid 'that learned Biſhop) or all the learn-'ed men that be alive, be able to bring 'any one ſufficient ſentence out of any 'old Catholick Doctor or Father, or 'out of any old General Council, or 'out of the Holy Scriptures of God, 'or any one example of the Primitive 'Church, whereby it may be clearly

'and

'and plainly proved, that there was
'any private Mass in the world for
'600 years after Christ, or that, &c.
'(*to the number of* 27. *Articles now in*
'*controversie between us and the Church*
'*of* Rome) I am content to yield and
'to subscribe. And in his Apologie
for the Church of *England* he says,
'We came as nigh as possibly we
'could to the Apostolical Churches
'and the Ancient Bishops, neither did
'we direct our Doctrine only, but our
'Sacraments and form of Publick
'Prayers to their rites and institutions.
And after him the Church provided
by her constitutions, *Imprimis videant*
Anno 1571. *Concionatores, ne quid unquam pro con-*
cione doceant quod à populo religiose teme-
ri & credi volunt, nisi quod consentaneum
sit Veteri & Novo Testamento, quódq; ex iis docuerint Antiqui Patres
& veteres Episcopi collegerint. I add
only that of the Royal Martyr in his
discourse with *Henderson*, 3*d.* paper.
'When you and I differ about the
'sense of the Scriptures, and I appeal
'to the unanimous consent of the Fa-
'thers and the Primitive Church, you

'ought

'ought to find a more competent 'Judge, or to reſt in him that is pro-'poſed by me. And this ſhall ſerve to aſſoil that queſtion which our Author ſaith, *carryeth fire in the tail of it, and brings with it a piece of Doctrine which is ſeldom pleaſing to Superiors, p.* 200. But the fire proves an *Ignis fatuus*, and our Author himſelf brings water enough to extinguiſh it; for in *p.* 65. he ſaith, 'If *Ariſtotle* and *Aphrodiſeus*, 'and *Galen*, and the reſt of thoſe ex-'cellent men whom God hath endued 'with extraordinary portions of na-'tural knowledge, have with all 'thankful and ingenious men through-'out all generations retained their cre-'dit intire, notwithſtanding it is ac-'knowledged that they have all of them 'in many things ſwerved from the 'Truth; Then why ſhould not Chri-'ſtians expreſs the ſame ingenuity to 'thoſe who have laboured before us 'in the expoſition of the Chriſtian 'Faith, and highly eſteem them for 'their works ſake, their many infirmi-'ties notwithſtanding?

From

'and plainly proved, that there was
'any private Mass in the world for
'600 years after Christ, or that, &c.
'(*to the number of* 27. *Articles now in*
'*controversie between us and the Church*
'*of* Rome) I am content to yield and
'to subscribe. And in his Apologie
for the Church of *England* he says,
'We came as nigh as possibly we
'could to the Apostolical Churches
'and the Ancient Bishops, neither did
'we direct our Doctrine only, but our
'Sacraments and form of Publick
'Prayers to their rites and institutions.
And after him the Church provided
by her constitutions, *Imprimis videant*
Concionatores, ne quid unquam pro con-
cione doceant quod à populo religiosè teneri
& credi volunt, nisi quod consentaneum
sit Veteri & Novo Testamento, quódq; ex
iis docuerint Antiqui Patres & veteres
Episcopi collegerint. I add
only that of the Royal Martyr in his
discourse with *Henderson*, 3*d.* paper.
'When you and I differ about the
'sense of the Scriptures, and I appeal
'to the unanimous consent of the Fa-
'thers and the Primitive Church, you
'ought

Anno 1571.

'ought to find a more competent 'Judge, or to reſt in him that is pro-'poſed by me. And this ſhall ſerve to aſſoil that queſtion which our Author ſaith, *carryeth fire in the tail of it, and brings with it a piece of Doctrine which is ſeldom pleaſing to Superiors, p.* 200. But the fire proves an *Ignis fatuus*, and our Author himſelf brings water enough to extinguiſh it; for in *p.* 65. he ſaith, 'If *Ariſtotle* and *Aphrodiſeus*, 'and *Galen*, and the reſt of thoſe ex-'cellent men whom God hath endued 'with extraordinary portions of na-'tural knowledge, have with all 'thankful and ingenious men through-'out all generations retained their cre-'dit intire, notwithſtanding it is ac-'knowledged that they have all of them 'in many things ſwerved from the 'Truth; Then why ſhould not Chri-'ſtians expreſs the ſame ingenuity to 'thoſe who have laboured before us 'in the expoſition of the Chriſtian 'Faith, and highly eſteem them for 'their works ſake, their many infirmi-'ties notwithſtanding?

From

From this general contempt of the Fathers our Author proceeds, *p.* 206. to caſt a ſlurr on *S. Auguſtine*. For having mentioned *S. Auguſtines* argument which he maintained againſt the *Donatiſts*, which was, *Unitatem Eccleſiæ per totum Orbem diſperſæ propter nonnullorum peccata non eſſe deſerendam*, (*i. e.*) that the Unity of the Church ſpread over the whole world ought not to be forſaken for the ſins of ſome few that were in its communion, he adds, 'that though it were *de facto* 'falſe, that *Donatus* his party ſhut up 'in *Africa*, was the only Orthodox 'party; yet it might have been true 'notwithſtanding any thing *S. Au-* 'guſtine brings to confute it. And 'contrarily though it were *de facto* 'true that the part of Chriſtians diſ- 'perſed over the face of the Earth 'were the Orthodox, yet it might 'have been falſe notwithſtanding any 'thing *S. Auguſtine* brings to confirm it. As if that learned Father who was as cloſe and exact a diſputant as the Church hath enjoyed ever ſince, had wholly miſtaken the queſtion,

of

or were unable to urge one argument *pro* or *con*, (*i.e.*) either for confutation of that wretched Schism, or for defence of the Catholick Church. That learned Father wrote a very large Volume against those Schismaticks, which contains so much both of wit and Argument, that there would not need any thing else to be said for the confutation of Schismaticks to the worlds end if his arguments were well understood and applyed. And when our Author proves the Donatists in two lines to be complete Schismaticks, first for choosing a Bishop in opposition to the former, secondly, for erecting new places for the dividing party to meet in publickly, I wonder with what confidence he could deny that *S. Augustine* had done so much in so many writings and disputations. But when I consider how palpably this Author contradicts himself; I cease to wonder that he should oppose and contemn that Great man. For, *p.* 208. he seems with some passion to interrogate, 'Why might 'it not be lawful to go to Church with

'the

'the Donatists? and *p.* 215. 'why 'may I not go if occasion require to 'an Arrian Church? when *p.* 229. he says expressly, 'that it is not law-'ful no not for prayer, hearing, con-'ference, *&c.* to assemble otherwise 'than by publick order is allowed. And if our Author knew not that as well the Schism of the Donatists as the heresie of the Arrians was often condemned and forbidden by the Emperors and Councils of that age, he was very ignorant indeed.

But the reason which our Author gives, why *S. Augustine* said nothing to the question, is as strange as any thing else. '*S. Augustine* (saith our 'Author) brought nothing to prove 'that the Orthodox were the true 'Church, or the Donatists were Schis-'maticks. For the Church may be 'in any number, in any place, coun-'try or nation, it may be in all, and for 'ought I know it may be in none, 'without prejudice to the definition 'of a Church or the Truth of the Go-spel. He might as well have told us of a Church in *Utopia*, which is the same

ſame with a Church in no place, country or nation. What Idea of the Church our Author conceived I cannot imagine, but that which he expreſſeth concerning it is as contrary to the truth of all the Prophecies of the Old Teſtament, as well as the deſcription of it in the New, from whence the definition is taken, as light is to darkneſs. For *Acts* 2. 41. *ad finem*, the Church is deſcribed to be a number of men (not all nor none) called out of the world by the preaching of the Apoſtles, and joyning themſelves to their Spiritual guides by Baptiſm and breaking of Bread, by publick Prayers, and hearing the Word. Theſe in *verſe* 47. are expreſly called the Church, and to this Church the Lord added daily ſuch as ſhould be ſaved. Now ſuch Churches were by Chriſt's commiſſion to be planted in all Nations, which we believe was really effected; and the truth thereof is ſtill apparent, that God hath given his Son *the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmoſt parts of the earth for his poſſeſſion:* and therefore to ſay that a

Church may be in none, either number or place, (for I ſuppoſe the Author intends both, becauſe if it may exiſt in no place, it muſt not conſiſt of any number, nor ſo much as admit of one) as contrary to ſenſe and Reaſon as to the Truth of the Goſpel. And is ſuch a fancy as that of Mrs. *Trask*, who having ſhifted from one Conventicle to another in *New-England*, and at laſt on pretence of impurity in their ordinances and members, ſeparated from them all, affirmed, that ſhe alone was the Church and Spouſe of Chriſt. But I think Mr. *Hales* himſelf ſufficiently refutes this fancy of our Author. *Page* 185, & 186. of his *Golden Remains* he tells us, 'that 'to prove the exiſtence of our Church 'before *Luther*, all that is neceſſary 'to be proved in the caſe is no-'thing elſe but this; that there hath 'been from the Apoſtles times a per-'petual ſucceſſion of the Miniſtry to 'preach and to baptize, of which by 'the providence of God there remains 'very good evidence to the world, and 'ſhall remain.

Having

Having told us that the Church may be in no place, that is in effect that there may be no Church, he doth with the more confidence affirm, *p.* 213. 'That Church Authority is 'none, and tradition for the moſt part 'but figment. *Anſw.* As to traditions in general I defend them not, nor can any man elſe; but for ſuch as bear the Characters, which *Vincentius Lirinenſis* deſcribes, *quod ubique, quod ſemper, quod ab omnibus*, we have all reaſon imaginable to inforce the imbracing of ſuch traditions as have been received and delivered to us by all the Churches of Chriſt, in all ages and in all places, unleſs we were of the Authors opinion, that Church authority is none; and this can never be made good but by proof of our Authors fiction of a Church in *Utopia*. For if our Saviour did out of mankind redeem a Church by his own bloud; if he planted it by his Apoſtles, and promiſed his preſence with it to the end of the world; if he made it the ground and Pillar of Truth, and promiſed to hear her prayers, and to

bind in heaven what they bound on earth, and that the gates of Hell, *i. e.* neither perſecutions, nor hereſies, nor ſchiſms ſhould prevail againſt it: doubtleſs there is a Church, and that Church hath ſome authority granted to her by her dear Redeemer, to defend that peace and unity, as well as thoſe truths, which he bequeathed to her. Did our Saviour take care for the Church of the *Jews* only, or did he not alſo mind the Chriſtian Church, when *Matt.* 18. 17. he enjoyns us even in private differences among our ſelves, much more in thoſe which concern the publick peace of the Church, as in the caſe of ſcandals mentioned in the context, *v.* 7. to *go tell the Church*; and if any ſhould neglect to hear the Church, that he ſhould be unto us *as an heathen man and a Publican, i.e.* Excommunicate from that holy Society; which puniſhment being ſpiritual doth clearly evince, that the cauſes ſubmitted to the judgment of the Church were ſpiritual alſo. But I demand farther, did the Apoſtles uſurp more authority

rity than was given them, when they aſſembled together, *Acts* 15.6. about the caſe of Circumciſion; and after the difference had been fully debated by *Peter*, *Paul*, *Barnabas* and *S. James* in the preſence of the Elders and the multitude, they all agreed, and that by the approbation of the Holy Ghoſt, *v.* 28. to impoſe upon the Churches certain conſtitutions as neceſſary to be obſerved at that time for the peace of the Church? If they did not, then the Church had ſome authority. And ſo when *S. Paul* pleaded the cuſtom of the Churches of God againſt contentious perſons in the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Epiſt. c.* 11. *v.* 16. And doth not the ſame Apoſtle tell us, that when our Saviour aſcended up on high, *Eph.* 4. 11. he placed rulers and governors in his Church, whoſe care it ſhould be to provide that the people ſhould not be *thenceforth* as children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine by the ſlight of men, and cunning craftineſs whereby they lie in wait to deceive, *v.* 14. If Church authority be none, to what

end did *S. Paul* injoyn *Timothy* to ſee that women ſhould keep ſilence in the Church, 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. not only to teach but command, 1 *Tim.* 4. 11. to give charge concerning widows, 1 *Tim.* 5. 1, 7. how to receive accuſations againſt Elders, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. how to ordain, 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. and ſee that they held faſt the form of ſound words, 2 *Tim.* 1. 13. to ſuppreſs ſtriving about vain words and prophane bablings, ſuch as were the diſcourſes of *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*, which did eat as a canker and overthrew the faith of ſome, 2 *Tim.* 2. 14, 16. to rebuke (authoritatively) ſuch as would not endure ſound doctrine, but agreeably to their own luſts did heap up teachers to themſelves, having itching ears, 2 *Tim.* 4. 2, 3. And in like manner that *Titus* ſhould ſuffer no man to deſpiſe his authority, *Titus* 2. 15. but diligently diſcharge the duties for which the Apoſtle ſetled him in *Crete*, *i. e.* to ſet in order things which were wanting, and to ordain Elders in every City, *Titus* 1. 5. and to reject hereticks after a ſecond admonition, *Titus* 3. 10.

Beſides

Beſides we find the Spirit of God commending the Angel of the Church of *Epheſus* for ſhewing her hatred againſt the *Nicolaitans*, and blaming the Angel of the Church of *Pergamus* for tolerating the Doctrines of *Balaam* and the *Nicolaitans*, and the Angel of *Thyatira* for permitting the Doctrine and practice of *Jezebel*, *Rev.* 2. 6. &c. Nor did I ever hear yet of any Conventicle that pretended to have the face of a Church, that did not exerciſe ſome authority over their members: for as the Synod of *Dort* declared, No order nor peace can be preſerved in the Church, if it ſhould not be lawful for it ſo to judge of its own members, as to reſtrain within bounds wavering and unſetled ſpirits. This hath been the practice of the Churches of all Ages; the particulars to which their authority did extend are not now to be reckoned, nor the arguments for vindication thereof neceſſary to be inſiſted on: I ſhall ſhut up this with that of *Beza*, *de pace Eccleſiæ*: *Neque enim Dei gratiâ ignoro Eccleſiam eſſe veritatis teſtem, extra quam non ſit ſalus,*

& Orthodoxorum conſenſum in Synodis adversùs Hæreticos plurimi fieri par eſt, & Patrum in interpretandis Scripturis, in refutandis erroribus, in admonendis populis, labores adeò non contemni oportet, ut ſecundo à Scripturis loco meritò habeantur. Theſe things do certainly infer, that Church-authority is ſomething. However our Author, *p.* 224. dares to tell us, that † 'They do but abuſe themſelves and others that would perſwade us, that Biſhops by Chriſt's inſtitution have any ſuperiority above other Men further than of Reverence. And the reaſon which he gives for it is this, 'For we have believed him that told us, that in Jeſus Chriſt there is neither high nor low, and that in giving honour every Man ſhould be ready to prefer another before himſelf. Which reaſons do as certainly conclude againſt Magiſtrates as Biſhops, *viz.* that there is no obedience, no tribute or homage due to them by *Chriſt*'s inſtitution, nothing further than an airy ſuperiority of reverence, which if the other were denyed would be but a mockery; Like that wherewith the late

late Royal Martyr was Reverenced, when the Uſurpers robbed him of all that God and the Laws inveſted him withall, and gave him only the ſuperiority of reverence in a Noble Death. But as to Biſhops, let our Author's Aſſertion Anſwer it ſelf: For *firſt*, It grants that Biſhops were by Chriſt's inſtitution, becauſe by his inſtitution they had a ſuperiority of reverence above other Men. *2ly*, This ſuperiority was grounded on their Office as Biſhops, that is, Overſeers of the Flock committed to their charge, which Office was aſſigned to them by the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 20. 28. And now I would have the Reader conſider whether thoſe that by the inſtitution of Chriſt and of the Holy Ghoſt were made Rulers and Governors of the Church, have no other ſuperiority above other Men beſide that of reverence? There is more expreſſed, *Hebr.* 13. 17. in theſe words, *Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves.* And when St. *Paul* inſtructs *Timothy* in the office of a Biſhop, he tells him how he ſhould learn to *rule* the Houſe

of

of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 4. by ruling well his own houſe, having his children in ſubjection with all gravity. Again, when he chargeth *Timothy*, 1 Ep. 5. 17. to provide that thoſe Presbyters that did not only rule well but laboured (above others) in the Word and Doctrine, ſhould be counted worthy of double honour, he intended ſomewhat more than a ſuperiority of Reverence, namely an Honorary maintenance, ſuch as was the portion of the elder Brother under the Law, not a precarious Eleemoſynary ſtipend, but that which was as due to them as the hire is to the labourer; and I ſuppoſe that this is by Chriſt's inſtitution, the Apoſtle aſſuring us, that as it was ſetled by a Divine inſtitution under the Law, *Even ſo hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Goſpel ſhould live of the Goſpel*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. Beſides, the Apoſtle grounds the ſuperiority of Reverence on that of the office of governing, labouring and watching for the Souls of the People. So 1 *Theſſal.* 5. 12, 13. *We beſeech you Brethren to know them which labour among*

among you, and are over you in the Lord and admoniſh you, and to eſteem them very highly in love for their works ſake. And that the Apoſtles were ſuperior in office not only to the People, but to the 72. Diſciples, and to the Deacons, is clearly evinced by the Scriptures; for upon the miſcarriage of *Judas* another being to take his office, *Acts* 1. 20. the Apoſtles met together, and in a ſolemn aſſembly after prayer and ſupplication the lot fell on *Matthias*, who was one of the 72. Diſciples, and had accompanied the Apoſtles all the time that the Lord Jeſus went in and out among them. And this method was to continue, by Saint *Paul*'s advice to *Timothy*, 1 Ep. 3. 13. where ſuch as had uſed the office of a Deacon well, are ſaid to purchaſe to themſelves a good degree, *i. e.* as the Aſſembly expound it, doth deſervedly purchaſe to himſelf the honour of a higher office in the Church. And whereas we read, *Acts* 1. 3. that our Saviour Chriſt after his Reſurrection converſed 40. days with his Apoſtles, ſpeaking of the things pertaining to

the

the Kingdom of God, *i. e.* the teaching and governing of his Church; and when he aſcended up on high he gave ſome Apoſtles, ſome Prophets, *&c.* not only for the work of the Miniſtry, but preventing of falſe Doctrines and Schiſms, *Epheſ.* 4. 11--14. compared with 1 *Cor.* 12. 25, 28, 29. it is evident there was a ſuperiority of office as well as of reverence given to the Teachers & Governors of the Church. For God hath ſet theſe ſeveral orders in his Church, firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, *&c.* all are not Apoſtles, nor all Prophets, nor all Teachers, there were ſome even by God's inſtitution above others in place and office as well as in reverence; whereof we cannot expect a better proof than the Univerſal practice of the Churches of Chriſt even in the Apoſtles days, and immediately after their deceaſe. For unleſs we could conceive that all the Churches ſhould even in thoſe Primitive times conſpire together to caſt off ſome other government appointed by Chriſt, and admit of this to which they could have no temptation

tion or inclination, the People and Bishops both, being then as sheep appointed to the slaughter, we must needs conclude, that a superiority of office and government, as well as of reverence was their due. Now not only the Persons that were set over the Churches, and had the Characters of Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction, are plainly recorded in the Writings of the Ancients; but their power and superiority over Presbyters and Deacons, their supreme care and inspection of the affairs of the Church are so fully explained, as if they had been written on purpose to prevent the objections of these later days. For instance, we read in Authentick Authors of

St. *James* at *Hierusalem*,
St. *Mark* at *Alexandria*,
Timothy at *Ephesus*,
Titus at *Crete*,
Crescens at *Galatia*,
Archippus at *Coloss*,
Epaphroditus at *Philippi*,
Gaius at *Thessalonica*,
Apollos at *Corinth*,

Linus

Linus and *Anacletus* at *Rome*,
Ignatius at *Antioch*,
Papias at *Hierapolis*,
Dionysius Areopagita at *Athens*:

Yea the Ancients tell us particularly who were those seven Angels of the *Asian* Churches that are either approved or reprehended for their government, Viz.

Antipas at *Pergamus*,
Polycarp at *Smyrna*,
Carpus at *Thyatira*,
Sagaris at *Laodicea*,
Melito at *Sardis*,
Onesimus at *Ephesus*:

And *Ignatius* gives the Angel of the Church of *Philadelphia* the like character as the Spirit of God doth, though I find not his name. It were no great difficulty to set down the Successors of divers of these Bishops through many ages of the Church, together with the dignity and power they had as well over Presbyters as People: *Ignatius* and *Clemens*, *Tertullian* and *Irenæus*, *Eusebius*

Euſebius and *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſpeak largely of them. I ſhall hope to ſatisfie the Reader with a paſſage or two out of St. *Hierome*, who is thought no Friend of Epiſcopacy, yet in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, he ſays, *Whatever Aaron and his Sons and the Levites could vindicate to themſelves in the Temple, the ſame may Biſhops, and Presbyters and Deacons challenge to themſelves in the (Chriſtian) Church.* Here you have a plain diſtinction of Orders. And in his Epiſtle to *Riparius* you have a diſtinction of Power, for ſpeaking of *Vigilantius* an Heretical Presbyter, he ſaith, *Miror ſanctum Epiſcopum in cujus parochia eſſe Presbyter dicitur, acquieſcere ejus furori, & non virgâ Apoſtolicâ, virgâque ferreâ confringere vas inutile, & tradere in interitum carnis, ut ſpiritus ſalvus ſiat*; I wonder the holy Biſhop in whoſe Dioceſe the Heretical Presbyter is ſaid to be, doth not reſtrain his madneſs, and with his Apoſtolical rod as with an Iron rod break that unprofitable Veſſel, and deliver him for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that his Soul may be ſaved. So that there was a *ſub* and *ſupra* by

Chriſt's

Christ's institution, it did not all come from composition and agreement of Men among themselves, as Mr. *Hobs* and our Author do affirm.

But if there were indeed a superiority of reverence due to Bishops by Christ's institution, I fear the Author sinned against that institution when he spake so irreverently of them, as in Page 226. speaking of contentions between Bishops; 'Private and indifferent Persons may as securely be 'spectators of those contentions in respect of any peril of conscience, as at 'a Cock-fight where Serpents fight, 'who cares who hath the better? the 'best Wish is that both 'may perish in the fight. * I know not under what temptation the Author was when he wrote this, nor did he himself consider from what spirit it came. St. *Jude* tells us, v. 9. that *Michael the Archangel, when contending with the Devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation*: but this

* *Ità convitiis debacchatur ut plusculum in eo modestiæ desiderare cogor; utinam argumentis tantùm egisset, & à convitiis temperâsset.* Eras. in præfat. Epist. Hieron. ad Vigilantium.

this Author (whether *Aerius* revived, or the Ghoſt of that Monſter *Smectymnuus* become incarnate, (no Archangel I am ſure) doth not only deſpiſe Dominions, and ſpeak evil of Dignities, but breaths out fire and utter deſtruction, againſt Epiſcopacy root and branch. Who the contending Biſhops were of whom he ſpeaks, I have told you in the controverſie between *Victor* and *Polycrates*, the one contending too violently for a truth, the other too tenaciouſly defending an ancient but erroneous cuſtome. The errors of both would extract pity and prayers from any Chriſtian ſpirit, that were ſenſible of humane infirmities. When there aroſe a contention among *Chriſt*'s own Diſciples, *Luk.* 9. 46. which ſhould be the greateſt; And when the diſpute about circumciſion ſomewhat like this aroſe between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and them that came down from *Judæa*, did Chriſt or his Apoſtles think themſelves as unconcerned at theſe contentions, as at a Cock-fight? or had it been a fit option to wiſh that they might all periſh? How deſtru-

ctive are the curſes of ſuch men, when their prayers, their beſt wiſhes are for deſtruction? There appears more of the Serpent in this raſh vote, than in all *Victor*'s contention.

But our *Author* thinks he may be well excuſed for this uncharitable vote againſt Biſhops, ſeeing 'they had ſo 'little charity as by their frequent con-'teſts to make butter and cheeſe of 'one another, *p.* 220.

It is a ſad ſtory to read the great violences acted by ſome Biſhops, and the indignities and tortures indured by others in that period of time to which *Socrates* confines his Hiſtory: for in the cloſe of it he ſays, it contained the Hiſtory of 140. Years from the beginning of *Conſtantine*'s Empire unto the 17. conſulſhip of *Theodoſius*: In all which time *Socrates* relates with as much ſorrow, as our *Author* ſeems to do with merriment, what agonies and convulſions the *Arian* Hereſie made in ſome Churches, and the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts* in others, where the Factions (being cruel and implacable) as often as they got any power, did not only

only make butter and cheeſe but ſhed the bloud of the Orthodox and more peaceable Biſhops. There are ſtill ſome ſuch as would gladly reduce them again to butter and cheeſe, and like vermin corrode and devour them too. If any be of the Authors mind, I hope and pray that God would give them repentance, that they may live ſo peaceably under the Biſhops of the Church here, that they may live eternally with the Biſhop of their Souls hereafter: Or if they ſhall deſpiſe my advice, I intreat them to conſider that of Mr. *Hales*, *p.* 223. 'It 'being a thing very convenient for the 'peace of the Church, (to have but 'one Biſhop in one *See*, at one time) 'neither doth it any way ſavour of 'vice or miſdemeanor, their puniſh-'ment ſleeps not who unneceſſarily 'and wantonly go about to infringe 'it.

I meet with one obſervation more fit to be animadverted on under this head which is in *page* 218, *&c.* 'The 'third thing I noted for matter of 'Schiſm, was, Ambition, I mean

'Epiſcopal ambition, ſhewing it ſelf 'in two heads; one concerning Plu-'rality of Biſhops in the ſame See, 'another the Superiority of Biſhops in 'divers Sees. *Ariſtotle* tells us, that 'neceſſity cauſeth but ſmall faults, but 'Avarice and Ambition were the 'mothers of great crimes. He in-ſtanceth in the Sees of *Alexandria*, *Conſtantinople*, *Antioch* and *Rome*.

I am glad our Author found no inſtances of Epiſcopal ambition nearer home; if there had been any, in all probability he would have told us of them. If he had been a friend to the Epiſcopal Order, he would rather have done as *Conſtantine* ſaid he was ready to do with his Biſhops, make his royal robes a covering for their infirmities, than like a *Cham* diſcover the nakedneſs of thoſe Fathers. The beſt of Biſhops are but men, and ſo are ſubject to the like paſſions and infirmities as other men. I have already inſtanced in the Apoſtles and other diſciples of Chriſt; and certainly it is not chriſtianly done ſo to aggravate the faults of particular perſons as to

reflect

reflect upon the whole office. Beſides, our Author might have mentioned as many and as dangerous Schiſms made by covetous and ambitious Presbyters as by the Biſhops; *Novatus* and *Novatian*, *Aerius* and *Arrius*, *Donatus* and his fellow Presbyters, who aſſumed the Epiſcopal power to themſelves, and ſhed more bloud, and committed more outrages than were done under any inſtance of Epiſcopal ambition. *See the Hiſt. of* Donatiſts.

I will not inſiſt on any foreign compariſons, our late Schiſm at home is ſo freſh in our memories, and the wounds made by it are yet ſo open, that there needs no other Rhetorick than our own experience, to teach us that the little finger of the Presbyterians was heavier than the Epiſcopal loins. Let any perſon ſum up together the miſchiefs occaſioned by the avarice and ambition of Biſhops for 500 years together in this Nation of ours, and I dare engage to demonſtrate, that for wickedneſs in contriving, for malice and cruelty in executing, for pride and arrogance in

uſurping, for obſtinacy and implacableneſs in continuing and endeavouring ſtill to perpetuate our unparalleled confuſions; though many Biſhops have done wickedly, yet our Presbyterians have exceeded them all. For let me be informed whether for a Junto of Presbyters, who had often ſworn obedience to their lawful Ordinaries, as well as allegiance to their Prince, to caſt off all thoſe ſacred obligations, and dethroning one incomparable Prince, to advance many Tyrants, and by covenanting againſt one Biſhop in a Dioceſs, erect 100, or 200, in the ſame See, and expoſe all to contempt and miſery that would not partake with them in their ſins, whoſe tender mercies Mr. *Hales* himſelf found to be cruel, being deprived of that plentiful eſtate which he enjoyed under the Epiſcopal Government, and reduced to that extremity that he was forced to ſell his books for the ſupply of his neceſſities: let me be informed I pray, whether this be not more than any Biſhop ever did or could be guilty of? Such indignities, perjuries,

juries, uſurpations and cruelties againſt an Equal, as theſe men have acted againſt their juſt, lawful and excellent Governors both in Church and State, I believe have not been acted ſince *Judas* betrayed his Maſter.

P. 225. Our Author infers from the Scriptures before mentioned, 'That thoſe ſayings cut off moſt cer-'tainly all claim to ſuperiority by title 'of Chriſtianity, except men can think 'that theſe things were ſpoken only to 'poor and private men. Nature and 'Religion agree in this, that neither 'of them hath a hand in this heraldry 'of *Secundum Sub & Supra.* All this 'comes from compoſition and agree-'ment of men amongſt themſelves. The firſt Scripture referred to by our Author is, I ſuppoſe, *Gal.* 3. 28. *There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; for ye are all one in Chriſt Jeſus.* Here is not a word of high nor low in this nor any other Scripture that I can find in our authors ſenſe; for the Apoſtle only ſhews, that as to our acceptance by God in Chriſt there is no reſpect of perſons; but as

he had ſaid, *verſe 26. ye are all the children of God by faith in Chriſt Jeſus.* No difference from country, relation, ſex or condition, but as the King's Manuſcript, Ἅπαντες ὑμεῖς ἐστε Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ye are all Chriſts: *i.e.* of his myſtical body, *utcunque alia ſunt diverſa,* as *Calvin* obſerves, the relation of King and ſubject, Parent and child, Husband and wife, Maſter and ſervant notwithſtanding. Not that theſe relations are deſtroyed, for then Chriſtian Religion would be of all factions the moſt intolerable. *Eſtius* on this place intimates, that leſt the *Galatians* ſhould think they got advantages by being in Chriſt, he tells them the *Jew* if he believed was as good as the Gentile, the bond as the free, which is therefore firſt named. And if this ſenſe could be applied to this Scripture which our Author gives, then might the *Quakers* uſe it to defend all their rudeneſs, becauſe there is neither high nor low; and the Family of love for all their carnality, becauſe there is neither male nor female in Chriſt Jeſus.

The

The second Scripture is *Rom.* 12.10. *In giving honour let every one prefer another before himself:* which place is so far from licensing any Christians to deny honour to those Superiors to whom it is due, and strictly injoyned in the next chapter, that it obligeth them to give it to equals and inferiors, as S. *Bernard* says, *The first degree of Christian humility is, Inferiorem se exhibere Æquali; secundus, Æqualem se exhibere Inferiori; tertius, Inferiorem se exhibere Inferiori,* in all which the giving honour to our Superiors, is not mentioned, being a duty that nature it self doth teach. The Assembly gives a right sense of this Scripture: *Christian humility teacheth us not only not to prefer our selves above our equals, nor to equal our selves to our betters, but in some cases to equal our selves to our Inferiors.* So that we need not think these things were spoken to poor & private men, but were to be the common duties of all Christians without prejudice to their particular relations, all which Christianity provides for. S. *Paul* instructs *Timothy, as the Servant of the Lord to be gentle to all men, apt to teach, patient,*

patient, in meekneſs inſtructing thoſe that oppoſed themſelves. But withal he incourageth him *to teach and to command, to rebuke and reprove, to ſee that no man did deſpiſe him,* and leaves to him the government and care of the Church of God at *Epheſus.* Where there is true Chriſtianity, there will be as much humility and meekneſs in the hearts and lives of Kings and Princes, Biſhops and Prieſts, as of the meaneſt Peaſant. And therefore the Monks of *Bangor* were not adviſed amiſs; That they ſhould know whether *Auſtin* that was ſent by *Gregory* the Great to be an Arch-Biſhop, was a ſervant of God or no, if he did meekly ſalute them, and behave himſelf humbly towards them as to his Brethren.

Secondly, Both Nature and Religion agree in this Heraldry, that all Families and Societies of men, and therefore the Church of God alſo, have ever born ſomething in chief; the Father was ever above the Son, and the Prieſt, who for a long time was the Father of the Family, was ſuperior to the people: All did not come

come by compoſition and agreement. To evince this, I ſhall aſſert theſe three propoſitions: 1. That God is to be Worſhipped, is a dictate of the law of Nature. 2. That men ought to gather themſelves into aſſemblies for the Worſhip of God, is a reſult of the ſame Law. 3. That in thoſe Societies there ſhould be a power and government for the preſervation of it ſelf is from the Law of Nature, and by conſequence from the Law of God, both which have directed a *Sub* and *Supra* in all Societies, and ingraven the principles of it in the Souls of men.

Firſt, That Nature teacheth us that God is to be Worſhipped. This impreſſion we find in *Adam*, not only before, but after the fall, who taught his Sons, as well *Cain* as *Abel*, to honour God with their ſubſtance. And we read, *Gen.* 4. 3. That *in proceſs of time*, that is ſay ſome, at the revolution of a determined time, which being deſcribed to be (in the Original) at the end of days, others think it to be meant of the Seventh or Sabbath day, *Cain brought of the fruit of the ground*

ground an offering to the Lord, and Abel also brought of the firſtlings of his flock and the fat thereof. Whether they brought it to a deſigned place, or to their father *Adam* as their Prieſt, I ſhall not now enquire. I ſhall only give you an obſervation of the learned Doctor *Outram* on this place: That the period of days whereon *Cain* brought his offering, was at the end of Harveſt, and the time of *Abels* offering was when his flocks were increaſed, at which ſeaſons both of them being inſtructed by natural reaſon (for no command doth appear) thought it meet to return to God ſome part of the bleſſing given them by God. And whereas it is ſaid, *Heb.* 11. 4. that *by faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent Sacrifice than Cain,* which ſome think could not be ſaid to be done *in faith* unleſs it had been in obedience to ſome command of God; He conſenteth with ſome others, that this place doth evince the contrary, becauſe if *Abel* had ſacrificed according to ſome expreſs command, we cannot conceive but *Cain* offered upon the

the ſame command alſo, and ſo might be ſaid to have done it by faith as well as *Abel*, which is contrary to that text which implies that *Cain* did not. Whence it may be concluded, that they did neither of them preſent their offerings by virtue of any command, but according to a dictate of nature imprinted on their Souls as an acknowledgment of their ſeveral bleſſings received from him: which if *Cain* a wicked man was inclined to do by the light of nature, how much better may it be ſaid of *Abel* who was a good man? But it will be demanded, wherein that faith of *Abel* which is ſo commended did conſiſt? And the Anſwer is, in that he had ſo great a reſpect to the Dominion, power and goodneſs of God the author and giver of all bleſſings, and Lord of life and death, that he thought himſelf obliged to offer the beſt of his flocks in teſtimony of the Worſhip of his Creator, and of a thankful mind towards him. And indeed the light of nature might ſerve not only to direct the family of *Adam* who had ſo much of the

the knowledge of God, but others alſo that were removed into a greater darkneſs and ignorance. That as the inviſible God had manifeſted his eternal power and Godhead to them by things viſible, ſo they ought to agnize and honour their inviſible Creator and beneſactor by offering him ſome portion of thoſe viſible and ſenſible bleſſings which he had vouchſafed them. Theſe and ſuch like arguments ſaith Dr. *Outram*, *p.* 7. did ſo prevail with the Ancients, that they were of opinion that men did firſt offer ſacrifice from an inſtinct of natural reaſon and not from any command of God, for which he quoteth many learned Authors, and concludes with the Opinion of *Euſebius de demonſtratione Evangelica*, *l.* 1. *c.* 10. That *Cain* did of his own accord offer the fruits of the ground, but every good man as *Abel*, *Noah* and *Abraham* did by Divine reaſoning or underſtanding ſacrifice living creatures (κατὰ θείαν ἐπίνοιαν,) which as the learned Doctor proves, cannot be underſtood of a Divine Command. I ſhall add but this one

medium

medium more for the proof of my firſt propoſition, That the general inſtinct and inclination of Mankind to worſhip ſome thing as God, doth argue that the Light of Nature doth direct them that God is to be worſhipped; only through the decay and weakneſs of Reaſon they miſtake the Object, and are become ignorant of the right manner of ſerving him, which hath been the cauſe of all Idolatry. And it is very obſervable that whereas other dictates of Nature have been obliterated and diſuſed among divers Nations, this hath been conſtantly and univerſally obſerved by all with great ſolemnity: which is the ſecond Propoſition, *viz.*

That God muſt be worſhipped by Men in Society, is according to the Law of Nature, which I ſuppoſe our Author doth grant, *p.* 227. where he ſaith, 'It hath been at all times con-'feſſed neceſſary, that God requireth 'not only inward and private Devo-'tion, when Men either in their hearts 'and cloſets, or within their private 'walls pray, praiſe, confeſs and ac-'knowledge; but he further requires

'all

'all those things to be done in publick, 'by Troops and Shoals of Men. If this was always necessary, then sure before there was any positive command for it, God requiring it by the Law of Nature, which doth not only teach us that God is to be worshipped, but in such a manner as may best display his excellencies, and manifest that he is glorious in praises, which cannot be done in a corner but in the great Congregations, and therefore God so graciously accepted the intention of *David* and *Solomon*'s devotion in building him that great Temple at *Jerusalem*, where all the Tribes of *Israel* at Solemn times should meet together to offer up their prayers, and to give thanks to the Name of the Lord. And before we read of any precept for this purpose, we find, *Gen.* 4. 26. that in the days of *Enos* the Grand-son of *Adam* by *Seth*, that is, as soon as there was a competent number to make a Solemn Assembly, *Men began to call upon the Name of the Lord*, viz. in Publick Assemblies, as the best Expositors do interpret it. Which farther appears, in that

that all Nations have built Temples, ſet a-part ſolemn Feſtival days, and inſtituted Prieſts, and myſterious Rites, for the honour of their Gods; which they have done without any previous command or commerce with more civilized or religious Nations. As therefore it is ſaid of the riſe of *Nile*, which in plentiful ſtreams ſpreads it ſelf over *Egypt*, and yet the Origin of it cannot be found, that it comes from Heaven: ſo theſe ſolemnities of Aſſemblies and ſacred Rites for the Worſhip of God being found to abound every where, and no humane inſtitution can be alledged as the riſe of them, we may conclude them to flow from Heaven into the Souls and Conſciences of Men. But St. *Chryſoſtome* on *Hebrews* 10. asks how God came to command it? and he anſwers, by condeſcending only, and ſubmitting himſelf to humane infirmities; which condeſcenſion *Oecumenius* thus expreſſeth: *Becauſe men had a conceit, that it was convenient to offer up ſome part of their ſubſtance unto God, and they were ſo ſtrongly poſſeſſed with this conceit, that*

if they offered it not to him, they would have offered it up to Idols; *God* (saith he) *rather than they ſhould offer unto Idols, required them to offer unto himſelf.*

The third Propoſition is, That it is a reſult of the Law of Nature, that ſuch Societies ſhould have a power to preſerve themſelves. For ſeeing God nor Nature do any thing in vain, and without this power all Societies will ſoon be diſſolved and periſh, it follows, that both by the Law of God and Nature thoſe Societies that are aſſembled for the Worſhip of God, ſhould have a power to maintain and preſerve themſelves. This * Mr. *Hales* affirms: There is a neceſſity of diſproportion or inequality between Men; for were all perſons equal, the World could not ſubſiſt. Now this inequality and power implie a ſuperiority in ſome, and a ſubordination in others; for, *par in parem non habet poteſtatem*: if every one were left at his own liberty, as none could rule, ſo none would obey: That therefore there ſhould be both *ſub* and *ſupra* is of the ſame Law of Nature, without which there could be

* Serm. on Joh. 18. 36. p. 146.

be no government or order at all either in Civil or Eccleſiaſtical Societies. And ſeeing, as *Ariſtotle* obſerved, that the Paternal power was the Original of all Government, *Pol. l.* 1. *c.* 2. every Father governing his Family both as a Prince and as a Prieſt in the moſt ancient times; it is evident, that both by Nature, and Religion, there ought to be a *ſub*, and *ſupra*; and if ſo, our Saviour never did nor intended to alter ſuch Laws, but to reinforce and to confirm them; which that he did hath been already proved. However whether this power ſhall be exerciſed by one or more Perſons, and be derived by Succeſſion, or applied by election, this is to be regulated according to ſome poſitive determination either Divine or Humane. And if the Law of God, or where that is ſilent (which I think it is not in the caſe of *ſub* and *ſupra*, in Eccleſiaſtical officers) the Law of Man ſhall ſet up one or more Governors for the government of the Church, the Perſons advanced by ſuch authority ought to have more than a Superiority of Reverence, name-

ly of obedience and a willing ſubmiſſion in all lawful and honeſt commands. I conclude therefore with my Author, *p.* 193. Communion is the ſtrength and ground of all Society, whether Sacred or Civil: whoever therefore they be that offend againſt this common Society, and Friendlineſs of men, and cauſe ſeparation and breach among them, if it be in Civil occaſions, are guilty of Sedition or Rebellion; if it be by Occaſion of Eccleſiaſtical differences, they are guilty of Schiſm. And it ſhall alway be a part of my Litany, From all ſedition, privy conſpiracy and rebellion, from all falſe Doctrine, Hereſie and Schiſm, from hardneſs of heart and contempt of thy Word and Commandments, good Lord deliver us.

I ſhall conſider only one inſtance more of the Author's too great indulgence to Schiſm and Hereſie; and then leave it to the Reader to judge, Whether the opinion of the Ancients, as it is generally received by our Modern Divines, or the fond conceptions of the Author, be more agreeable to the

nature

nature of the things, or conducing to the peace and proſperity of the Church. The inſtance is that of the ſecond Council of *Nice*, of which he ſays, *p.* 211. 'That until that Rout did ſet 'up Image-worſhip, there was not any 'remarkable Schiſm upon juſt occaſi-'on of fact. To this our Author gives an Anſwer himſelf, *page* 201. where he deſcribes Schiſm on matter of fact to be ſuch a ſeparation as is occaſioned by requiring ſomething to be done by us, which either we know or ſtrongly ſuſpect to be unlawful; and concludes, *p.* 202. that the firſt notable Schiſm of which we read in the Church (*viz.* that concerning the obſervation of *Eaſter*) did contain in it matter of fact. Now how can theſe two aſſertions be reconciled? That until the Schiſm occaſioned by ſetting up Image-worſhip there was not any remarkable Schiſm upon juſt occaſion of fact; And that the firſt notable Schiſm that we read of in the Church, (*viz.* that about *Eaſter*) did contain matter of fact, and it was 600. Years before a Schiſm ſo notable, as that our Author

Anno 787.

Anno 168.

thinks, *p.* 203. all the World were Schiſmaticks. And if our Author be right, the occaſion of fact was juſt; for he determines it to be ſo, when ſomething is required to be done by us which either we know or ſtrongly ſuſpect to be unlawful. And the *Aſian* Churches thought it unlawful for them to ſubmit to the authority of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who would impoſe on them a rite contrary to an ancient cuſtome of theirs, to be received as a matter of faith: of which before. Again, he inſtanceth in the Schiſm of the *Donatiſts* which was a complete Schiſm by our Author's own rules; for they did not only *erigere Altare contra Altare*, ſet up Biſhop againſt Biſhop (to which, our Author obſerves, that St. *Cyprian* imputed the Original of all Church-diſorders, *page* 222.) but they erected alſo new Churches and Oratories for the dividing Party to meet in publickly, which ſerves to make a Schiſm complete, *p.* 196. ſo that there were notable Schiſmes long before that occaſioned by ſetting up Image-worſhip. To that which follows

lows in our Author, *p.* 211. concerning Image-worſhip ſet up by the ſecond Council of *Nice* I fully accord, 'That in this the Schiſmatical party 'was the Synod it ſelf and ſuch as con-'ſpired with it. For concerning the 'uſe of Images *in Sacris*, *firſt* it is ac-'knowledged by All, That it is not 'a thing neceſſary; 2. That it is by 'moſt ſuſpected; 3. It is by many held 'utterly unlawful; and that the in-'joining of ſuch a thing can be no-'thing but abuſe: And the refuſal of 'communion here cannot be thought 'any other thing than duty. All this is true; but our Author ſpeaks not the whole truth: he calls that only ſchiſm which was hereſie in a fundamental point concerning the Worſhip of God according to his expreſs will in the ſecond Commandment. And when that Council had the confidence to condemn them as Hereticks that were the *Iconocleſtæ* or adverſaries to the worſhipping of Images, we may with more truth account them who were *Iconolatræ*, worſhippers of Images, Hereticks, if not Idolaters. By the way let me

obſerve, that if it be my duty to withhold communion from ſuch as ſet up a falſe way of worſhipping God, as this Council did, it is my duty alſo to withdraw from the Communion of ſuch as profeſs falſe opinions of the true God, as the Arrians, *&c.* did, to whoſe aſſemblies the Author ſees no reaſon but we may joyn our ſelves, *p.* 215. Though this be contrary to his own rule, *p.* 218. 'It is alike un-'lawful to make profeſſion of known 'or ſuſpected falſhoods, as to put in 'practice unlawful or ſuſpected Actions.

I hope the Reader will not think his patience injured, if on this occaſion I give him a brief account how Images were firſt brought into the Church of God, and what reception they found in the Primitive times; of both which I ſhall ſpeak briefly. They were firſt brought in by lewd hereticks, and ſimple Chriſtians newly converted from Paganiſm, the cuſtoms whereof they had not fully unlearned. Biſhop *Uſher* in his Anſwer to *Maloon*, *p.* 508. gives this particular, that the *Gnoſtick* hereticks had

had ſome Images painted in colours, others framed of gold, ſilver and other matter, which they ſaid were the repreſentations of Chriſt, made while he was in the power of *Pontius Pilate*. The *Collyridians*, who at certain times offered Cakes to the Virgin *Mary*, did alſo cauſe Images of her to be made. *Carpocrates* and *Marcellina* his companion brought the Images of *Jeſus* and *Paul* to *Rome* in the time of *Anicetus*, and worſhipped them. But the more plentiful ſeeds of this Idolatrous worſhip were ſown by the heathen converts, as *Epiphanius* obſerves. *We have ſeen the pictures of* Peter *and* Paul *and of Chriſt himſelf* (ſaith he) *for that of old they have been wont by a* heatheniſh cuſtom *thus to honour them whom they counted their benefactors or Saviours.* And the *Arrians* and *Donatiſts* having for a long time rent the Church of God and pulled down the Fences both of Church and State, they made way for vaſt numbers of Infidels to enter, among whom the Chriſtians being mixed and living in ſubjection to them in divers places, they

they learned this cuſtom alſo of making and honouring the Images of thoſe whom they accounted their Patrons and benefactors. Men of heretical perſwaſions were the firſt that were tainted, worſhipping the Graves and Pictures of their Leaders, then theſe painted toyes inſnared the vulgar, and at *Rome* under *Gregory* the ſecond the worſhip of them is firſt practiſed and defended, but at the ſame time oppoſed by *Leo Iſauricus* and his ſucceſſors. And in a Council at *Conſtantinople* 338 Biſhops condemned it, *Anno* 754. the primitive Fathers having before that time conſtantly diſputed againſt the very making and painting of Images as well as worſhipping them, whoſe teſtimonies againſt Images it will be in vain to heap up here. I think it enough to obſerve, that ſince Biſhop *Jewel* challenged the Church of *Rome* to ſhew but one authority out of the Ancients for ſetting up of Images in the Churches and worſhipping them, during the firſt 600 years, there hath not yet been any tolerable reply made. But in the year 787.

Hadrian

Hadrian being Biſhop of *Rome*, and *Tharaſius* of *Conſtantinople*, like *Herod* and *Pilate* were reconciled in this miſchievous deſign, and having the opportunity of a female Governeſs (for *Dux fœmina facti*) they prevailed with *Irene* the Mother of *Conſtantine* to aſſemble a *Council* at *Nice* (which the Papiſts call the ſeventh Oecumenical Council, but by the Ancients was condemned as a Pſeudo-ſynod.) This *Irene* was a Pagan, the daughter of a Tartarian King, and an Imperious tyrannical woman, who in deſpite to the Council of *Conſtantinople* that had decreed againſt Images, ſummoned this Synod, which ſhe ſo far defended, that ſhe cauſed the eyes of her own ſon *Conſtantine* to be pulled out becauſe he would not conſent to the Idolatrous having of Images, as Bp. *Jewel* obſerves in the Article of Images, where you may ſee more of the ignorance and impiety of this Synod. This was the woman that called this meeting of the Biſhops, and you may gueſs under what fears they were of the cruelty of that woman who was ſo unnatural to her Son. He that will be ſatisfied more fully

fully concerning the Ignorance of this *Synod*, may read it in their Acts mentioned by *Binius* or *Surius*, or in Bishop *Jewel* concerning the Worshipping of Images (*ubi suprá.*) *Mittens Irene convocavit omnes Episcopos*, saith *Baronius ad annum* 787. (so that the Pope had not then the power of calling Councils by the Cardinals own confession.) There was great intercourse of Letters between *Hadrian* and *Tharasius* before this Council was assembled, which was done at last by *Tharasius* perswading of *Irene*, and then there met 350 Bishops, who agreed in this *base* decree for the adoration of Images, as Bishop *Usher* calls it. In this *Synod* the question for admission of lapsed Bishops and Presbyters was first proposed, and although the Bishops that were readmitted were tainted with Arrianism, as appears by the Synods demand, that they should in the first place make an acknowledgment of the blessed Trinity; yet *Baronius* slightly passeth over that, and makes mention only of their submission to that point, which as well the

the Cardinal as that Synod chiefly designed to advance, *i. e.* the worshipping of images. *Basilius* of *Ancyra*, *Theodorus* of *Myrene*, and *Theodosius* Bishop of *Amorium* are first called, and these three *post confessionem Sanctissimæ Trinitatis* (of which the Cardinal says nothing more) make a large profession of their sorrow for having adhered so long to the *Iconoclastæ* or oppugners of Image-worship, and present a confession of the Orthodox Faith (as he calls it) in opposition to those errors and hereticks to which they had adhered. Now what that Orthodox faith was, appears by the Confessions mentioned by *Baronius*, wherein they did Anathematize them that broke down the images, as Calumniators of Christians, and such as did assume the sentences that are in the Scriptures against Idols, and apply them to the venerable Images; with much more to the like purpose. But concerning their reception into the Church, the question is greatly agitated; and the books being produced by which it did appear that *Athanasius*,

Cyril

Cyril and other ancient Pillars of the Church had received notorious hereticks into the Church, a Biſhop of the Province of *Sicilia* objects, that the Canons of the Fathers which had been produced were enacted againſt the *Novatians*, *Encratiſts* and *Arrians*, *hujus autem hæreſis magiſtros quo loco habebimus? but in what rank* (ſaith he) *ſhall we place the Maſters of this hereſie?* To which it was replyed by a Deacon of the ſame Province, that it ſhould be conſidered, *Minórne eſt quæ nunc novata eſt hæreſis, an major illis quæ hactenus fuere, whether this new-ſprung hereſie were greater or leſs than thoſe that were before it.* This is reſolved by *Tharaſius*, *malum perpetuò idem eſt & æquale, That evil is alway the ſame*, which ſounding too Stoical, one *Epiphanius* a Deacon and repreſentative of *Thomas* Arch-Biſhop of *Sardinia*, ſolves it by ſaying, *That it held true, eſpecially in cauſes Eccleſiaſtical* (*A quibus decretis cùm parvis, tùm magnis errare idem eſt, ſiquidem in utriſque lex divina violatur,*) *for to erre from ſuch decrees whether in ſmall matters, or great is a con-*

contempt of the Divine law. But *John* a Monk Deputy for the Oriental thrones pronounceth this hereſie worſe than all other hereſies, and of all evils the worſt, as diſturbing the whole Oeconomy of Chriſt. However their penitents being but few, for we find not above three or four mentioned, they reſtore three of them to their dignities, and one other, *Gregory* Biſhop of *Neocæſarea*, who was judged to be a chief Leader of the *Iconoclaſts* was admitted only to the Communion of the Church, not to his Biſhoprick although he declared for Image-worſhip. But the *Anathema* is denounced againſt many others who abhorred this Idolatrous practice, (profeſſing they did reject all images made by the hands of men, and worſhipped that only, *Qua filius Dei in Sacramento panis & vini ante paſſionem ſeipſum expreſſit,*) as did the whole Council of *Fremen-tum*, *Theodoſius* Biſhop of *Epheſus*, *Siſinnius* of *Paſtilla*, *Baſilius* and others. And ſhortly after *Charles* the Great aſſembleth a Council of the Biſhops of *Italy*, *France*, and *Germany* at *Francfort*,

fort, Anno 792. of the tranſactions whereof we have four books yet extant, in which we have not only the Canons of that Council, but many Imperial Edicts for the taking away of Images, and forbidding any worſhip to be given them. Sir *Henry Spelman, p.* 305. of his firſt Volume of Councils acquaints us that *Charles* the Great ſent a book to *Offa* King of the *Mercians*, wherein Images were decreed to be worſhipped by this Synod of *Nice:* of which he tells us from *Hoveden*, That in that book many things diſagreeing and contrary to the true faith were found, eſpecially that Images ought to be worſhipped, *which the Church of God doth utterly condemn.* And that *Alcuinus*, Maſter to *Charles* the Great, but by birth a *Britan*, in an Epiſtle written in the name of the Biſhops and Princes of *England*, and ſent back to *Charles* the Great, did wonderfully overthrow that opinion of the *Nicene* Council by teſtimonies of Holy Scripture, which moved him to call that Synod of *Francfort* conſiſting of 300 Fathers, who refuted

refuted and condemned this decree of worshipping Images: which is the cause (saith that Author) why the Monuments of that Synod are suppressed. And I suppose that all the Reformed Churches, especially the Church of *England*, cannot but abhor those that established so great an iniquity by a Law. I remember the learned Doctor *Jackson*, *p.* 113. of his Treatise of the Church, saith, that by the self same stroke, by which this Council did *de facto* thrust all other out of the visible Church that would not worship Images, they declared themselves to be excommunicated *de Jure*, from the Holy Catholick Church, and by consequence from Salvation. When therefore our Author endeavours by his Rhetorical flourishes to make such destructive errors to dwindle into schisms, and allows only the names of schism, *p.* 213. to Arrianism, Eutychianism, *&c.* I thought I had just cause to except against his first Paragraph, especially when I found how much it took not only with the Fanaticks and some witty men of our days, but with

persons of real worth and learning, one of which (whom I forbear to name) repeats the whole clause in a book of good note in these words: *It is very well observed by a learned and judicious Divine* (quoting the Tract of Schism, which he calls *that little but excellent Tract of Schism*) *that heresie and schism as they are commonly used, are two Theological Scarcrows with which they who use to uphold a party in Religion use to fright away such, as making inquiry into it, are ready to relinquish and oppose it, if it appear either erroneous or suspicious.* For as Plutarch *reports of a Painter, who having unskilfully painted a Cock, chased away all cocks and hens, that so the imperfection of his Art might not appear by comparison with nature: so men willing for ends, to admit of no fancy but their own, endeavour to hinder an enquiry into it, by way of comparison of somewhat with it, peradventure truer, that so the deformity of their own might not appear.* This story of a Cock I shall Answer with another of a Hen; for I have seen a Countreyman with the picture of a Hen Pheasant

ſant artificially drawn on a ſtained cloth, and a little Pipe to call the Cock-pheaſants, to draw them from place to place, until in purſuit of their pleaſures they have been taken in a Snare. The reputation of the Author is as a Pipe which calls unwary Perſons to view the Pictures on that ſtained cloth, whereof they that grow too fond may follow them to their own deſtruction.

Our Author, *page* 215. gives his advice for the compoſing of *Liturgies*: 'Were Liturgies and publick forms of 'ſervice ſo framed, as that they admitted 'not of particular and private fancies, 'but contained only ſuch things as in 'which all Chriſtians do agree, ſchiſms 'on opinion were utterly vaniſhed. For 'conſider of all Liturgies that are or 'ever have been, and remove from 'them whatſoever is ſcandalous to any 'Party, and leave nothing but what 'all agree on, and the event ſhall be 'that the publick ſervice and honour 'of God ſhall no way ſuffer. Where-'as to load our publick forms with 'the private fancies upon which we

'differ, is the moſt ſoveraign way 'to perpetuate Schiſm to the Worlds 'end. Prayer, Confeſſion, Thankſ-'giving, Reading of Scriptures, Ex-'poſition of Scripture, Adminiſtration 'of Sacraments in the plaineſt and 'ſimpleſt manner, were matter enough 'to furniſh out a ſufficient Liturgy, 'though nothing either of private 'opinion, or of Church-pomp of Gar-'ments, of preſcribed Geſtures, of I-'magery, of Muſick, of matter con-'cerning the Dead, of many ſuperflui-'ties which creep into the Churches 'under the Name of Order and De-'cency did interpoſe it ſelf: for to 'charge Churches and Liturgies with 'things unneceſſary was the firſt be-'ginning of all Superſtition.

We have a *Devonſhire* Proverb---

He that builds his houſe by every ones chop
Shall never ſee his Ouice drop.

If every Man's fancy ſhould be complied with, in the framing of a Liturgy, it is moſt certain we ſhould never have any; ſeeing as there is ſcarce any part a-

It is impoſſible to propound any form of Liturgie wherein both parts can hold it lawful to communicate. Infidelity unmaſked, p. 216.

gainſt

gainſt which ſome do not except, ſo others are offended at the very form, as being a ſtinting of the Spirit; and the oppoſing of a Directory to the Ancient Liturgy, ſhews that this was the ſenſe of the Presbyterians themſelves, which appears alſo by this, that when they had in the Grand Debate given in their Objections to the Liturgy, ſome of the Brotherhood had prepared another form, but a great part of their Brethren objected many things againſt that, and never as yet did (that I hear of) agree upon any other, nor I think ever will. For let it be conſidered that there is ſcarce any part of our Liturgy which ſome have not excepted againſt, and you will find our Author's advice impracticable. He himſelf would have no Abſolution, as appears, not only by his omiſſion of that Office, when he enumerates the parts of a Liturgy, but by telling us, that the power of the Keys belongs to every one, Clergy or Lay, Male or Female, not only for himſelf, but for the benefit of others, *p.* 172. and *p.* 183. that you may as well make your Mu-

letter your Confeſſor, as your Pariſh-Prieſt; Others will have no confeſſion; Some are diſpleaſed at the Reſponſes, others cannot be reconciled to the Lord's Prayer, againſt the uſe of which as the Leaders of one Faction have Printed, ſo the Grandees of another have often preached. The Reader knows what ſort of People cannot joyn in the *Gloria Patri*, the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creeds, and it is well if they will ſtand to the Apoſtles. The *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* are diſpleaſing to ſome; the Collects, becauſe they are too ſhort, and the Litany becauſe it is too long, to others. Some are angry at the Prayer for Biſhops, others not very well pleaſed with thoſe for the King. If you read what our Author ſaith, *p.* 60. concer-
† ning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, (as 1. that in the Communion there is nothing given but Bread and Wine; 2. The Bread and Wine are ſigns indeed, but not of any thing there exhibited, but of ſomething given long before; 3. That Jeſus Chriſt is eaten at the Communion-Table in no ſenſe

neither

neither ſpiritually by vertue of any thing done there, nor really nor metaphorically nor literally. 4. The Spiritual eating of Chriſt is common to all places, as well as the Lords Table:) you may ſee the Author was no friend to the Office for Adminiſtration of the Lord's Supper. And it's well known who are enemies to that of Baptiſm. Our Author diſlikes the conſecration of Biſhops, to whom he denies any Superiority but that of reverence, others oppoſe the Ordination of Prieſts. It is ſad to conſider at what a Diſtance many of our People yet keep themſelves and children from the Catechiſm and Confirmation, and the burial of the Dead; only that of Marriage they are pretty well reconciled to. So that I ſay, our Author's Propoſals are impracticable if not impoſſible to be obſerved, either to remove from our Liturgies whatever is (*i. e.* ſeems) ſcandalous to every Party, or to leave nothing but what all agree on; and I think we ſhall all agree ſooner in an Univerſal character and language too, than in ſuch a Liturgy.

Our first Reformers have given us undeniable Proofs that they were very learned and very good Men, and Bi-
* ubi supra. shop * *Jewel* in their name professeth that they did consult the ancient Liturgies of the purest times, and adapted ours to them. The *Papists* condemn us for castrating as much as was thought sinful, must we be still condemned for retaining what is decent? If any thing in our Liturgy had been contrary to the Word of God, I am confident the Church would have expunged it as soon as its adversaries had discovered it: but if it be quarrelled at for requiring us to worship God according to the Apostolical injunction in Decency and order, we had rather be accounted beasts of burden in submitting to the lawful Ordinances of our Superiors, than wild Asses for kicking against our Masters. It hath alway been the practice of the Church of God, conform to the practice of the Holy Apostles, *Acts* 15. when any opinions or practices contrary to Faith or Unity began to prevail, to assemble in Councils and Synods, that by conference and con-

conſulting with the Scriptures and Primitive cuſtomes, they might raiſe a fence againſt the growing torrent, and as well confirm their own, as confute the opinions and practices of their adverſaries; as may be ſeen in the Decrees and Canons made in the firſt 600 Years. And when by general conſent and ſubſcription theſe Decrees were approved, they did as occaſion required inſert ſometimes into the Liturgy ſuch paſſages out of their own or former Articles, as might help to inſtruct the People in the true Faith, and be an antidote againſt thoſe poiſonous errors that were become Epidemical. Hence firſt the Apoſtles Creed, and the *Gloria Patri, &c.* and thoſe being not expreſs enough againſt prevailing errors, the *Nicene* and *Athanaſian* Creeds were inſerted, and ſome whole Articles were added to the Apoſtles Creed. And if, as our Author ſaith, a man may go to an *Arrian* Church, ſo there be no Arrianiſm expreſt in their Liturgy, why may not our Superiors require our communion in the Liturgy which is free from that and all other Doctrinal errors?

errors? And whereas our Liturgy is in all things conform to our Articles of Doctrine, which are so free from the exceptions either of *Calviniſts* or *Arminians*, as that both Parties appeal to it as to the ſtandard whereby they would have their Opinions tryed, as appears in the late quiquarticular controverſies between Doctor *Heylin* and Mr. *Hickman*; I ſee no reaſon why they may not upon our Author's grounds conform much rather to ours than unto *Arrian* Liturgies. A Liturgy that hath paſt many fiery Trials, firſt in the *Marian* days, when the Compoſers of it imbraced it at their Martyrdom, after which it appeared ſo inoffenſive to the *Papiſts* themſelves, which I account no ſmall commendation, that for ſome Years after Queen *Elizabeth* came to the Crown, they omitted not to frequent the uſe of it, and in the beginning of our troubles when the *Smectymnuans* heated the Irons, and made it paſs the trial Ordeal, its innocency was ſuch that it came off untouched. And when in the Grand Debate their Succeſſors thought to have blown it

up

up by the fewel which they had heaped together in a mock-liturgy, their plot was ſo confuſed and imperfect, that a great part of the Brotherhood were of the Opinion that the old was better. And I am ſtill perſwaded, if it were put to the vote whether this Liturgy ſhould be retained, or any other formerly uſed in the Primitive, or now in uſe among the Reformed Churches brought into its room, they would give the like ſuffrage as I have heard Sr. *Harry Martyne* did when ſome of *Cromwels* Confidents had moved the queſtion, whether They ſhould have a King or no King, that if they muſt have a King, they had rather have the Old Gentleman (meaning King *Charles* of bleſſed memory) than any other in the Nation.

Our Author begins to treat of *Conventicles* from *p.* 226. and continueth it to the end. The ſubſtance of which I ſhall preſent to the Reader in theſe ſeveral and divers Periods.

Firſt, he ſays truly, that all meetings upon unneceſſary occaſions of Separation are to be ſo ſtiled, ſo that in this

ſenſe

ſenſe a Conventicle is nothing elſe but a congregation of ſchiſmaticks. And he had before, *p.* 196. determined them to be ſchiſmaticks, 1. That do chuſe a Biſhop in oppoſition to the former, and 2. That do erect a new Church and Oratory for the dividing party to meet in publickly. Now our Author, *p.* 200. moves the queſtion, 'Who ſhall judge what is a neceſſary ¶ 'occaſion of ſeparation? which queſti-'on, he ſays, hath been often made 'but never truly Anſwered; not be-'cauſe it is a point of great depth or 'difficulty truly to aſſoil it, but be-'cauſe the true ſolution carryeth fire 'in the tail of it; for it bringeth with 'it a piece of Doctrine which is ſel-'dom pleaſing to Superiors. To you 'for the preſent this ſhall ſuffice, if ſo 'be you be *Animo defæcato*, if you have 'cleared your ſelf from froth and 'grounds, if neither ſloth nor fears 'nor ambition nor any tempting ſpirits 'of that nature abuſe you (for theſe 'and ſuch as theſe are the true impedi-'ments why both that and other que-'ſtions of the like danger are not truly

'An-

'Answered) if all this be and yet you 'see not how to frame your resolution 'and settle your self for that doubt, I 'will say no more of you than was 'said of *Papias* S. *Johns* own Scholar, 'you are ἀνὴρ μικρὸς τὰ νῦν, your abi-'lities are not so good as I presumed.

This question is so easie to be resolved, that (as our Author thinks) *every person may settle himself, and resolve what to do in it, if he be* Animo defæcato, *and have cleared himself from froth and grounds, if neither sloth nor fears nor Ambition nor any tempting spirits of that nature abuse him.*

One or more of these impediments it is probable prevailed with our Author not to determine the question so plainly as he ought, and most likely that of fear, because he saith it would be displeasing to Superiors, and would carry fire in the tail of it. And doubtless his fears were just, it could not do otherwise than provoke his Superiors in a high degree, if he had peremptorily delivered what he intimates in diverse parts of the Treatise to be his Opinion, and when I shall collect them

them you will see they carry wild fire and powder-plots in their tails enough to blow up all Government.

The Question is, who should judge what is a necessary Occasion of Separation? Which question he intends not to leave to the judgment of Governors, whom he supposeth to give the Occasion and to whom the resolution would not be pleasing, but to those that take the occasion; and indeed he leaves it to private persons to judge of the Laws of their Superiors, who if they cannot find will easily feign some occasion to excuse their separation. And our Author hath fitted it to their hands, for he informs them, p. 194. 'That when either false or 'uncertain conclusions are obtruded for 'truth, and acts either unlawful or 'ministring just scruple are required 'of us to be performed, in these cases 'consent were conspiracy; and open 'contestation is not faction or schism, 'but due Christian Animosity. And p. 201. He makes it a just occasion of separation, when 'something is re-'quired to be done by us which either

'we

'we know or ſtrongly ſuſpect, (which 'in our Authors phraſe is the ſame 'with juſt ſcruple) to be unlawful. And again, *p.* 218. 'Whereſoever 'falſe or ſuſpected Opinions are made 'a piece of the Church Liturgy, he 'that ſeparates is not the ſchiſmatick. So that now there needs no *Oedipus* to unriddle the myſtery. For 1. if our Governors ſhall at any time obtrude uncertain concluſions for truth (how certain ſoever they be to our Governors, if they appear not ſo to us:) Or 2. if they require ſomething to be done by us, which we may juſtly ſcruple or ſtrongly ſuſpect: Or, 3. if they ſhall make ſuſpected Opinions a piece of Church Liturgy; this is indeed ſufficient not only to juſtifie a ſeparation, but to entitle the Separatiſts to due Chriſtian Animoſity. And our Author needed not the ſpirit of Prophecy to foretel that this would be diſpleaſing to Governors and carry fire in its tail; for it ſtrikes directly at the foundation of all Government both in Church and State. For in both Governments when ſuch things

are

are by ſolemn Edicts commanded or forbidden as are apparently good or evil, we are to obey for Gods ſake; but where things neither good nor evil by any natural or poſitive law of God are injoyned by our Superiours, it is undoubtedly our duty to ſubmit to them. A ſcrupling Conſcience, or the diſſent of private judgments to the deliberate determinations of Superiors in theſe caſes can be no *ſuperſedeas* to the obedience that is due from ſubjects, as hath been already proved from the Nonconformiſts own confeſſions, and will yet more clearly appear.

To which end I ſhall premiſe out of Dr. *Owens* conceſſions, *p.* 408. of his ſurvey of Eccleſiaſtical Polity. *Thoſe pretended errors in our caſe* (ſaith he) *are not in matters of faith, nor for the moſt part in or about the Worſhip of God, or that which is acknowledged ſo to be; but in or about thoſe things which ſome think it convenient to add unto it or conjoyn with it. And what peace, what quietneſs is like to be in the world, when the ſword of vengeance muſt be drawn about*

about theſe things? To which I only reply, Let them that draw the ſword in ſuch quarrels periſh with the ſword. God hath put a ſword into the Magiſtrates hand, to be a terror to evil works, and if unpeaceable men will not be ſubject, neither for fear of wrath, nor for Conſcience ſake, but will raiſe tumults and ſeditious Factions againſt their lawful Rulers upon ſcruples and punctilio's, they are the Aggreſſors; and unleſs the Magiſtrate will ſuffer the ſword which God hath put into his hands, to be wreſted from him, he ought to be an Avenger to execute wrath upon evil doers, their ſcruples concerning the lawfulneſs of ſuch external acts of Worſhip notwithſtanding.

2. I premiſe, that ſuch men as are ſound as to the foundation of faith, and careful thereupon to build a holy life, and keep a Conſcience void of offence towards God and man, (though in ſuch things as Dr. *Owen* hath mentioned, they ſhould not be able through their weakneſs of judgment, after ſerious endeavours to get reſolution of

their ſcruples) if they do yield obedience to them that God hath ſet over them, though they ſhould be miſtaken, yet their errors would not prejudice their ſalvation. And on this ground many of the Reformed Divines hope well, of multitudes under the Roman tyranny, and I doubt not but the Nonconformiſts have ſo much Charity as to have as good hopes of ſuch honeſt Chriſtians as die in the Communion of our Church.

3. If it ſhould happen that ſome good and honeſt men who are both ſound in the faith and unblamable in life, do after ſerious inquiry remain ſcrupulous ſtill, it is their duty to take the ſafeſt way, and that is the way of obedience to their Lawful Governors, which being a moral duty and ſtrictly enjoyned by the word of God, cannot be diſpenſed with by ſcruples about the lawfulneſs of rites and ceremonies in the external worſhip of God. And I may ſafely add,

4. That if honeſt and well meaning men ſhall ſo far indulge to ſuch ſcruples as to live in diſobedience to the Laws

and

and constitutions of their Superiors; their Superiors may justly punish them for so doing, or the frame of their Government will soon be turned off its hinges: And Governors not being able to discern the hearts of men, may equally animadvert upon all refractory persons, or they must let all go unpunished; and if they should resolve on this later, farewell all Government. And seeing the wisdom of Man cannot prevent it, it is better that a few mistaken Innocents should be punished, than the peace and foundation of a Church or Nation be overturned. *Melius pereat unus quàm anitas.* Better is a private inconvenience than a publick mischief. This is a foundation necessary to the settlement of all humane Laws and Constitutions. Thus in matters of common right and interest, when the several Courts of a Nation have established and published rules and orders for the appearances and proceedings of Persons litigant, they who omit the

The taste of liberty is so sweet, that except Kings maintain their Authority with as great violence as the People affect their Liberty, all things will run to confusion. Golden Remains, p. 149.

time, or miſtake the right methods of pleading, and thereupon ſuffer damage, though as to the merits of their cauſe they be ſeverely dealt with, yet the proceedings of the Law are right and juſtifiable, becauſe it is more for the publick peace and eſtabliſhment that ſome perſons ſhould ſuſtain loſs for their unwilling neglects and errors, than that all wilful Offenders ſhould go unpuniſhed, and publick Orders of Court be contemned and diſobeyed. And this Rule holds much ſtronger in ſuch Eccleſiaſtical caſes as are now under our conſideration; becauſe the controverſie is not here between private perſons, but between Superiors and Subjects. If therefore one or more private Perſons purely on miſtake, and after humble and ſerious inquiry for ſatisfaction (though I think few ſober perſons uſing ſuch means can remain unſatisfied in ſo plain a caſe, Whether Scruples concerning ancient and innocent rites in the external Worſhip of God can juſtifie diſobedience to the conſtitutions of lawful Governors) ſhould ſtill judge contrary to their Governors,

vernors, who impoſe ſuch things as lawful and convenient, to be unlawful and ſuperſtitious, and thereupon refuſe to appear at their Courts and be ordered by them; It is agreeable to the Laws of all Societies that ſuch Perſons ſhould not go unpuniſhed. If a Child or Servant ſhall neglect to obey his Father or Maſter becauſe he hath ſome Scruples againſt his commands, I think ſuch Father or Maſter may without Scruple correct that Child or Servant, or within a ſhort time they will become incorrigible. And the Caſe is almoſt the ſame as if the debauched part of the Nation, who are morally vicious, ſhould pretend ſcruples of conſcience againſt ſuch Laws of the Land as reſtrain their enormities, ſuppoſe of Sabbath-breaking and neglecting the Publick Worſhip, which yet I think the Nonconformiſts would not judge to be a tolerable plea.

I have inſiſted ſo long on this argument not only becauſe our Author mentioneth it ſo often, and ever makes it a ground for ſeparation, telling us that *Not only in Reaſon but in Religion*

too this Maxime admits of no releaſe, Cautiſſimi cujuſque præceptum quod dubitas nè feceris; but often inſinuates them to be guilty of Schiſm that do require any ſuſpected thing, as you may ſee, *p.* 194. and *p.* 218.

Non enim nè dubium malum eveniat, certum & liquidum officium noſtrum deſerere debemus, nec vel ſanctiſſimos fines per illicita media conſectari. Diſſert. de pace, p. 77. *Quis erit Schiſmatum modus, ſi promiſcua diſſentio ad ſeceſſionem ſufficit?* p. 91.

After this Pipe all the Factions do dance. The Presbyterians in their Commiſſioners Papers ſuggeſt it frequently, whether Eccleſiaſtical conſtitutions concerning things which are or may become matter of diſpute and oppoſition, are to be allowed. * And *John Owen* for the Independents would have ſome warrant from Scripture for every thing that is required in the Worſhip of God. But minding my Reader of Dr. *Owen*'s conceſſions before mentioned, to which I ſhall only add the confeſſions of the Presbyterians, who from the beginning oppoſed our Rites and Ceremonies not as unlawful, but only as inconvenient, as Mr. *Cartwright* did in his ſecond Reply, *p.* 262.

* *See the Reaſons for Neceſſity of Reformation,* p. 36.

p. 262. and therefore perſwaded Miniſters rather to wear the Garments required by Law than ceaſe their Miniſtry. And in his *Evangelical Harmony* on *Luke* 22. *à verſu* 14. *ad* 19. ſaith, That kneeling in receiving the Sacrament being incommodious in its own nature, and made more incommodious by *Popiſh* ſuperſtition, is not ſo to be rejected, that for the ſake thereof we ſhould abſtain from the Sacrament: (His words are theſe, *Geniculatio in participatione ſuâ naturâ incommoda, ſuperſtitione pontificiâ longè facta eſt incommodior; Nec tamen propterea ita rejicienda, ut ejus nomine à Sacramento abſtineamus, ſi ejus cæteroquin participes eſſe nequimus, quia res ſuâ naturâ non eſt purè illicita*) becauſe the thing is not in its own nature utterly unlawful. From whence we may conclude, that ſuch things as are not purely unlawful in their own nature, though they are incommodiouſly applied and have been groſly abuſed by *Popiſh* ſuperſtition, are not a ſufficient cauſe to hinder our participation of Divine Ordinances. And yet to what miſchievous ends is this

forlorn ſcruple, of receiving that bleſſed Sacrament on our Knees, made uſe of by Fanatick Perſons as a Bar againſt the receiving of it at all? though it be a poſture ſanctified by the Son of God when in the days of his being in the fleſh he offered up Prayers to God, and hath been uſed by all ſober Chriſtians in their publick and private Devotions, and therefore moſt agreeable to that Solemn Office, wherein we cannot with ſufficient humility and reverence receive at the hands of God ſuch an ineffable bleſſing, nor worthily expreſs our humble acknowledgment of thankfulneſs to God. And in the act of receiving beſides our ſecret ſupplication to God to pardon and abſolve us from all our ſins for Chriſt's ſake, we joyn with the Miniſter to pray, that the Body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt which was given for us may preſerve our Bodies and Souls to Eternal life; though the Church hath uſed as plain and effectual a mean to prevent our being ſcandalized, and ſcrupled at it (by declaring in the Rubrick *that no adoration is intended or ought to be*

be done either to the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily receiued, or to any corporal preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and bloud; for the Sacramental bread and wine remain ſtill in their very natural ſubſtances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all Chriſtians. And that it was intended for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy receivers, and for avoiding ſuch diſorder and profanation in the holy Communion as might otherwiſe enſue) as the wiſdom of Men can invent; yet the outcry of Superſtition, Will-worſhip, and Idolizing the Creatures of Bread and Wine is kept up, and the hearts of the People filled with invincible prejudices and ſcruples, to the neglect and contempt of this neceſſary duty which by Chriſt's inſtitution and by Primitive practice ought to be frequently performed, and by the Conſtitutions of the Church at leaſt three times every Year, but hath been totally omitted by ſome very adult Chriſtians all their lives; contrary to the advice

advice and practice of former Nonconformists as well as to the commands of God and his Church. And what can the end of these things be, but hardning the People in their disobedience and ignorance, in uncharitable prejudices and distances from their more pious and peaceable Brethren, and provoking their Superiors to Acts of rigor and severity, unless they will permit all things to run to confusion? And whereas upon the late Test all Persons that had any publick office or imployment were required to receive this Holy Sacrament according to the Custome of the Church of *England*, or to forfeit that imployment, not one of an Hundred of those scrupulous Persons that were concerned continued a Recusant: I suppose they have sufficiently convinced the Magistrates that the best way of removing these Scruples is to require the more frequent practice of that duty under the like penalties.

And now I hope the frivolousness of our Author's position, *p.* 218. *That whereſoever falſe or ſuſpected Opinions* (and

(and he asserts the same of practising suspected Actions in the same period) *are made a piece of the Liturgy, he that separates is not the Schismatick*, doth evidently appear.

And if he that separates be not the Schismatick, then they that require the performance of a suspected action are so, and by consequence it will be in the power of every scrupulous faction to denominate their Governours to be the Schismaticks. As our Author determineth the case, a man may as innocently disbelieve any Article of his Christian faith upon this pretence of scruples against them, as disobey the command of his Superiors. *For* (saith he, *p.* 194.) *when uncertain conclusions are obtruded for truth, or acts ministring just scruples are required to be performed, consent were conspiracy and open contestation is not faction or schism, &c.* And *p.* 218. he gives this Reason for it, *It is alike unlawful to make profession of known or suspected falshoods, as to put in practice unlawful or suspected*

Now

Now ſuppoſe a ſubtle *Socinian* ſhould meet with a ſcrupulous perſon and tell him, that he doth well indeed to ſuſpend his Communion from that Church which impoſeth thoſe things to be practiſed in the worſhip of God, which have no warrant from thence, but are rather condemned as Will-worſhip and Superſtition; but yet while he ſtrains at a Gnat he ſwallows a Camel, and ſuffers his Conſcience to be impoſed upon in matters of Faith which are of greater concern: and then inſinuate, that there is no expreſs text in Scripture nor any good Argument from Reaſon for a Trinity of perſons in the Unity of the Godhead, but both Scripture and Reaſon affirm there can be but one Supreme eternal God; and then by wreſting the Scriptures, and perſwading him that the Doctrine of the Trinity had its riſe from Eccleſiaſtical Tradition not from the Scriptures, and they that require the belief of it *do teach for Doctrines the Commandments of men*: ſuppoſe, I ſay, by this leaven the ſcrupulous humor is fermented

mented and ſwells up into a ſtrong ſuſpicion, and he begins to grow ſowr and diſcontented with his Teachers, and likes the Arrian and Socinian Doctors better; Doth not this man proceed upon the Authors grounds, and may be as much juſtified by them if he turn Heretick, as if he become a Schiſmatick? And indeed there is not one Article of our Faith but cunning Sophiſters may work upon perſons diſpoſed to ſcruples to have ſtrong ſuſpicions of them. For Mr. *Baxter* tells us in his *Saints everlaſting reſt, Part* 1. *ch.* 7. *Sect.* 14. That Profeſſors of Religion did oppoſe almoſt all the Worſhip of God out of Conſcience, which others did out of Prophaneneſs. Upon this very pretenſe ſome will not hear of Infant Baptiſm, nor others of the Lord's day, but turn Anabaptiſts and Sabbatarians, and for ought I know others may juſtifie rebellion, and not only the Omiſſion of moral duties, but the Commiſſion of any vice or impiety. Experience hath evidently taught us, that thoſe perſons who have been

prone

prone to entertain ſcruples in matters of Religion firſt, have fallen next into ſedition and rebellion, and then to impiety and immoralities, to Quakeriſm, Atheiſm, unnatural affection to Parents, and acts and practices of as great cruelty and barbarity againſt themſelves as againſt others.

But our Author grounds his Objection on *Rom.*14.23. *Whatſoever is not of Faith is ſin*; and *He that doubteth is damned if he eat.* And this objection ſeems to be inforced by the Authority of Biſhop *Sanderſon*, who *p.* 228. *de Obligatione Conſcientiæ*, ſaith thus: *If any one through ſome faſt rooted error of judgment do think the Law to be unjuſt which is not ſo, the obligation of the Law doth remain, notwithſtanding that error of mind, ſo that he is not free from ſin if he do not obey; yet that he ſinneth more grievouſly if he ſhould obey, before that error be laid aſide.* Which caſe the Reverend Caſuiſt intended to ſpeak of more at large when he ſhould come to treat of the compariſon of both obligations, *viz.* (as I ſuppoſe) the authority of the Magiſtrate and

of

of Conſcience. For I perceive the queſtion to which he makes this an Anſwer was, What aſſurance that any Law is unjuſt, is required to ſecure a ſubject in point of Conſcience that he is not bound by that Law? But the good Biſhop never came to that point under which we might have expected his farther judgment in that caſe; and therefore I ſhall take a little pains in finding out his reſolution, in ſome other parts of his writings.

Anſwer. The Biſhop ſays: *If a ſubject, becauſe that probable reaſons do appear on both ſides, knoweth not nor can determine whether a Law be juſt or no, ſo that his judgment hang in æquilibrio not knowing to which to incline; in this caſe the ſubject is bound actually to obey, ſo that he ſinneth if he do not obey, and if he do obey he ſinneth not.* Now I obſerve, that when the Biſhop comes to give his reaſons why a ſubject ſhould obey againſt a ſcrupulous Conſcience, the ſame Reaſons do require his obedience though his ſcruples be inveterate and obſirmed, yea in things doubtful, as by theſe following Reaſons of his may appear. His

His first Reason is, because by a Reason of Law, *In dubiis potior est conditio possidentis*; therefore where there is a contest concerning a right betwixt the Lawgiver and the subject, the right is alway to be presumed to be on the Lawgivers side, as being in possession of the right, unless some fit reason can be given to the contrary: but in this case (*i.e.* in things doubtful) no such fit reason can be given, because it would destroy the supposition, which is, that the things are equally doubted of.

A second reason is taken from another rule of Law, That in a doubtful case the safer part is to be chosen: and it is certainly more safe to obey with a doubting Conscience, than not to obey with a doubting Conscience; Because secondly it is safer in giving honour to Superiors to exceed that measure which we owe, than to be defective in it. Thirdly Because from the same rule it is generally more safe that he who is free should think himself bound, than that he who is bound should think himself free: for seeing through

the

the natural pravity of mans heart he ſinneth more often through too much confidence than through too much fear, and we are more prone to carnal licentiouſneſs than is fit, and we are all too impatient to bear the yoke; unleſs we do with full purpoſe of mind reſolve to obey ſuch Laws as are not evidently unjuſt, the wiſdom of the fleſh and the craft of the Serpent thereunto added, will often ſuggeſt ſuch excuſes as will hinder us from doing our duty in this reſpect.

In his Sermon on *Rom.* 14.23. the Biſhop firſt ſhews what a doubting Conſcience is, namely when the ſcales hang even, ſo as a man cannot well reſolve whether way he ſhould rather take, *Sect.* 25. which he ſays, may be becauſe reaſons ſeem to be probable *pro* and *con*, and there are learned men of the one opinion as well as of the other; and *Sect.* 28. he ſays, If the liberty of the agent be determined by ſome Superior power to whom he oweth obedience ſo as he is not *ſui juris ad hoc*, to do or not to do at his own choice, but to do what he is comman-

ded; this one circumſtance quite altereth the whole caſe, and now he is bound in Conſcience to do the thing commanded, his doubtfulneſs of mind whether that thing be lawful or no notwithſtanding. And afterward he adds: Truly it is a great wonder to me that any man endued with underſtanding, and that is able in any meaſure to weigh the force of thoſe precepts and reaſons which bind inferiors to yield obedience to their Superiors, ſhould be otherwiſe minded in caſes of like nature. Whatever is commanded us by them whom God hath ſet over us either in Church, Commonwealth or Family (*quod tamen non ſit certum diſplicere Deo*, ſaith S. *Bernard*) which is not evidently contrary to the Law and will of God, ought of us to be received and obeyed no otherwiſe than

As for Orders eſtabliſhed, ſith Equity and Reaſon favour that which is in being, till orderly judgment of deciſion be given againſt it, it is but juſtice to exact of you, and perverſeneſs in you it would be to deny thereunto your willing obedience. Mr. Hooker's Preface. *I aſſert, that as to things in the judgment of the primitive and reformed Churches left undetermined by the Law of God, and in matters of meer decency and order, and wholly as to the form of Government, every one,* notwithſtanding what his private judgment may be of them. *is bound for the peace of the Church of God to ſubmit to the lawful determination of the lawful Governors of the Church.* Idem.

than if God himſelf had commanded, becauſe God himſelf hath commanded us to obey the higher powers, and to ſubmit our ſelves to their Ordinances. And in the cloſe of the 29 *Sect.* If the Conſcience be only doubtful whether the thing be lawful or no, but have not as yet paſſed a peremptory judgment againſt it (yea although he rather incline to think it unlawful) in that caſe if the Magiſtrate ſhall command it to be done, the ſubject with a good Conſcience may do it, nay he cannot with a good Conſcience refuſe to do it though it be *Dubitante Conſcientiâ.* And he is poſitive, *p.*240. *de Obligatione Conſcientiæ,* That there is no reaſon nor ſhew of reaſon yet given why the power of determining and appointing things indifferent ſhould not oblige in Eccleſiaſtical as well as in Civil affairs.

Pardon the repetition of the Arguments; becauſe as Diamonds are not cut but by Diamonds, ſo I could not preſume of explaining his meaning but by himſelf. And if the *Reader* will but add to this, what Mr. *Falkner* hath ſaid

concerning this objection from *Rom.* 14.23. he may eaſily perceive that neither that text nor any concluſions to be drawn from it can be preſt for the ſervice of our Separatiſts. For as he ſays, *p.* 425. This rule muſt be applyed to the ſpecial caſe intended, which is, that wherever the omitting any action is certainly free from ſin, and the practice of it appeareth to any perſon doubtful, there to do that action is a very evil and dangerous practice, becauſe it containeth in it a chuſing to run the hazard of Sin, which choice is alway a ſin. But the caſe is much different when both acting and forbearing may be doubted of, where the one of them is a duty, and it is impoſſible that both of them ſhould be forborn. For God having commanded Superiors to rule and Inferiors to obey, to ſuſpend all action here is to perform an inward moral action of choice about a matter of duty, which if it be not regularly managed is a ſin. And in this caſe ſo far as concerneth the obedience of a Child, Servant or Subject, they ought

to

to account their Superiors command to lay ſuch an obligation upon them to duty, that they muſt be guided thereby, unleſs they be able to prove themſelves bound to act the contrary.

Having thus removed the Objection concerning doubts and ſcruples, I may take liberty to recreate my *Reader* with a known ſtory of a Scrupling houſe erected in *Oxford* by ſome of the Viſitors, *Anno* 1646.

There was in S. *Peters the Eaſt* a place ſet a-part for all people that were diſſatisfied or troubled in mind to meet in every Tueſday, for reſolution of their doubts in a plain and familiar diſcourſe. Many Sermons were preached to commend the uſefulneſs of that Ordinance, which they grounded on ſeveral places of Scripture. One day while *Hen. Wilkinſon*, Sen. was Chairman, and Mr. *Reynolds*, *Harris*, *Temple*, *Corniſh*, *Lungly* and *Cheynel* were ſet down with him, ſome ſouldiers of the Independent party, *Erbury*, *Grymes*, *Hewſon* and others came to viſit the Viſitors, and after a while *Erbury* propoſeth his doubt, whether in the

Church of Christ the Ministery was committed to certain select men, for he thought all the gifted Brethren might preach; and declared his readiness to dispute it with them: but the pretending an Order, agreed upon for delaying the resolution of Scruples a week after the first proposal, put off the dispute until the next meeting. Which being noised through the University, a great concourse of Gentlemen, Scholars and Souldiers attended it. And *Erbury* who had been sometime of *Brasennose Colledge*, after a bold Prologue begun the Comedy, affirming, That in the Church of Christ there was no Commission given to Select men for preaching the Gospel. And after some discourse about stating the Question, *Erbury* urgeth, that if they had such a commission it was either Ordinary or Extraordinary. The Answer was, that it was Ordinary. He replies, then they had it from the Bishops, or some others. At which the *Doctores Resoluti* were unresolved what to Answer; for if they should say from the Bishops, they feared

feared to diſpleaſe the people to whom they had often preached that they were Antichriſtian, and yet they could not deny it, they having been all Epiſcopally Ordained. And ſo being put into ſome confuſion, and not replying directly, but ſeeking ſubterfuges, the ſouldiers were with great acclamations proclaimed Victors, and the ſcrupling houſe ſhut up, and the Comedy ended. But *nondum finitus Oreſtes.* I wiſh the Tragedies occaſioned by theſe ſcruples were ended alſo. But *Quouſque tandem*? How long will theſe Scrupuliſts halt between God and *Baal*, between the reaſonable ſervice of God in his Publick Worſhip, and the unreaſonable ſuggeſtions of thoſe imperious maſters that Lord it over their Conſciences? They that inject theſe Scruples to the minds of younger and weaker perſons are for the moſt part men of age and competent underſtanding, and in ſo long a time as they have been in travel with them, and knowing that as well their own temporal and eternal happineſs as the eſtabliſhment of the Church and

State depends on the reſolution of them, it may rationally be expected that after their mutual conference with one another in divers Aſſemblies to that end, and their ſolemn ſeeking of God, they ſhould have been able to diſcover where the ſinfulneſs of theſe things which they ſcruple at doth lye; or, that not being yet done, nor I think poſſible for wiſer Men than themſelves to do, they ſhould deliver the Nation and themſelves from thoſe throws and pangs which ſuch falſe conceptions have occaſioned. And when the Inventors of State fears and jealouſies have been aſhamed and confounded upon the diſcovery and puniſhment of their villanous deſigns, it is ſtrange that Men of ſuch tender Conſciences as our Church-reformers pretend to be, ſhould feel no regret for all thoſe real miſchiefs and confuſions which their fond ſuſpicions and ſcruples have occaſioned. Others may call this moroſe humour, conſcience and conſtancy, but in truth it is nothing elſe but a ſtubborn contumacy and a proud contempt of Superiors.

For

For a grand principle on which Government doth ſubſiſt, is, That Inferiors do ſubmit their own judgments to the Decrees of their Superiors in order to publick peace, which the Apoſtle plainly requires, *Submit your ſelves to every Ordinance of Man for the Lords ſake*, ſo that nothing can excuſe our diſobedience to Governors but their requiring ſomething contrary to the Command of God. When therefore they injoyn ſome things that are not unlawful in themſelves, and by reaſon of ſome ſcruples we refuſe to obey them; our very ſcrupling manifeſts that we know not, but they may be agreeable to God's will, and therefore our not obeying is a violation of the Law of God as well as of our Superiors. The greater authority always makes void the leſs. A Maſter cannot oblige his Servant againſt the command of his Prince, nor a Prince againſt the command of God; nor can our private Conſciences in any thing for which we have not a command from God, oblige us againſt the Decrees of our Prince. And when in all other

1 Pet. 2. 13.

other things we ſubmit our ſelves to the determinations of others that are wiſer than our ſelves, as in matter of health to the preſcripts of Phyſicians, in matters of right to counſel of Lawyers; I ſee not any reaſon why we ſhould not in the externals of Religion ſubmit our ſelves to them that have the rule over us as God hath commanded: unleſs we will give this as a Reaſon, that we think our ſelves wiſer and better than they, and that every Man ſhould be left to his own liberty, which is as much as in us lyeth to make void the Ordinance of God.

Beſides, the nature of thoſe things that come in competition ought to be conſidered. The Magiſtrate injoyns ſuch things for decency and uniformity in the Worſhip of God, as after mature deliberation conſulting the Word of God and the precedents of the moſt pure and primitive times he hath found to be moſt for edification; and the things which he injoyneth others he practiſeth himſelf, which he would not do if he had not found them

to

to be the beſt. Now if he be miſtaken, it is but in an indifferent or diſputable thing, the obſervance of which by himſelf or his Subjects, provided they be Men that follow peace and holineſs, will not prejudice their Salvation. Now on the Subjects ſide there lies at ſtake the great duty of Obedience to Governors, of reverence and decency in the publick Worſhip of God, of Charity and Unity with their Brethren, wherein if they be peccant, they withhold from *Cæſar* the things which are *Cæſars*, and from God the things that are God's, and from their Brethren the duties which they owe to all Men, with whom as far as it is poſſible, and as much as in them lyeth they ought to live peaceably. And can a little miſtake or irregularity in external Worſhip, if ſuch ſhould happen, be thought ſo great an evil, that for avoiding of it, we ſhould throw our ſelves over the precipices of diſobedience to Rulers, a contempt of God's ſolemn Worſhip, and living in debate, contention and perpetual vexation of our Brethren? Thoſe

things

things that are immutably and eſſentially good or evil ought more to be heeded than thoſe which are ſuch uncertainly and by accident or circumſtance only; and no good Man to avoid a doubtful ſcruple will run himſelf into a certain ſin. In ſuch things therefore as I have now diſcourſed of, it is certainly more ſafe to erre with our Rulers than to be in the right againſt them.

And thus I have diſcarded that Maxime of our Authors, which he ſaith not only in Reaſon but in Religion too admits of no releaſe.

Page 228. our Author ſaith--'While 'Men were truly pious, all Meetings 'of Men for mutual help of Piety and 'Devotion, whereſoever and by whom-'ſoever celebrated, were permitted 'without exception.

It is great pity but it had been ſo, yet that it was ſo will not appear. For I ſuppoſe our Author doth not mean by Men truly pious, thoſe that were Governors; for the more pious they were, the more care they alway had of the publick Worſhip, and ſuch as would

would not joyn in it, gave occaſion to have their piety queſtioned. For why, ſaith our Author, ſhould Men deſire to do that ſuſpiciouſly in private which warrantably may be performed in publick, *p.* 230. He muſt therefore be underſtood of pious Chriſtians that met for the Worſhip of God in times of Corruptions and Perſecutions, as he expreſſeth it. Now that ſuch Meetings whereſoever and by whomſoever celebrated were permitted without exception, whoever ſhall but run over the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory will find exceptions enough againſt it. Were not Chriſt and his Apoſtles and ſuch Converts as met with them truly pious, and * yet their Meetings were in great fear of being diſturbed, and they were perſecuted as no Friends to *Cæſar*, but ſuch as turned the World upſide down. And did not our Saviour foretel his Diſciples how they ſhould be hated and perſecuted for his ſake? Never were there more pious and peaceable Chriſtians than under the Emperors of *Rome* that preceded *Conſtantine*, yet they did generally by them,

* Acts 16. 12. Acts 13. 12.

them, as *Pilate* by the *Galileans* whose bloud he mingled with their Sacrifices, and haled all such to torments as would not deny Christ and burn their Bibles, and offer Incense to the *Pagan* Gods. *Trajan* was one of the mildest of those Emperors, and *Pliny* the Younger being required to certifie the practices and behaviour of the Christians in his days, acquainted the Emperor, that they did meet together in the Night and sung Hymns to Christ as to their God, which was their only crime; for as to other things, They bound themselves by an Oath not to run into any wickedness, not to commit Thefts, Murders or Adulteries, not to break their promises or withhold any thing committed to their trust, *l.* 10. *Epist.* 97. And yet besides those famous Bishops, *Ignatius*, *Clemens*, *Anicetus*, many Thousands of pious Christians were martyred; the Heathen were so far from permitting their Meetings howsoever and by whomsoever celebrated, that they hunted out private Christians, and upon their confessions that they were so they were

Plures efficimur quoties metimur à vobis; Crudelitas vestra est gloria nostra. Tertul. Apol.

were inſtantly condemned. If a Legion of Witneſſes will ſuffice, I ſhall produce that of the Noble *Thebean* Legion, conſiſting of 6666. Souldiers, who when *Maximinus* was Emperor and prepared to fight his Enemies, though they had often given teſtimony both of their valour and fidelity to his Predeceſſors, and had by the accuſtomed Oaths ſworn the ſame to him, (which Oaths *Vegetius de Re militari, l.* 2. ſets down in theſe words, *Jurant per Deum, Chriſtum & Sanctum Spiritum, & per majeſtatem Imperatoris, quæ ſecundùm Deum generi humano diligenda eſt & colenda, omnia ſe ſtrenuè facturos quæ præceperit Imperator, nunquam deſerturos militiam, nec mortem recuſaturos pro Romana Republicâ*) were yet required to luſtrate or expiate themſelves by offering ſacrifice to the Heathen Gods; which they refuſing to do, jointly profeſſing themſelves to be Chriſtians, he decimates the whole Legion, and ſlays every Tenth Man with the Sword, and afterward requires the ſame impiety from the reſt; but their chief Commanders who deſerve

ſerve to be mentioned in all Hiſtories, *Mauritius* Tribune of the Legion, *Exuperius* their Standard-bearer, and *Candidus* one of the Senatorian Order, exhorting them to conſtancy in the Chriſtian Faith, being required to bring their Legion to the Emperor at *Octodurus*, and there perform thoſe Pagan rites, anſwered, That they were ready in all things to obey the Emperors commands in fighting againſt his Enemies, only being Chriſtians they could by no means Sacrifice to his Gods. Whereupon they ſuffered another Decimation; at which the remainder of the Legion were ſo far from being daunted, that they all profeſſed themſelves of the ſame reſolution, and ſhould rejoyce to obtain the ſame honour of Martyrdom. Whereupon the Emperor Ordered his Army to fall on them, and cut them in pieces, which was accordingly done, not one of them ſeeking an eſcape. *Baronius ad Annum* 297. Nor were theſe Maſſacres only committed in the times of the ten perſecutions, but afterward when

when ſome Chriſtian Emperors infected with Arrianiſm had the power, they made havock of the peaceable and Orthodox Chriſtians, and denyed them the priviledge of publick or private meetings. And our Author himſelf obſerves, *p.* 228. That Chriſtian meetings under Pagan Princes, when for fear they durſt not come together in open view, were charged with foul imputations, as by the report of Chriſtians themſelves plainly appears. And again, *p.* 227. That time had taken leave to fix this name (of Conventicles) upon good and honeſt meetings, and that perchance not altogether without good reaſon. Which reaſon he expreſſeth, *p.* 228. it was eſpied that ill affected perſons abuſed private meetings for Religion to groſs impiety, and therefore both Church and State jointly gave order for Forms, times and places of publick Concourſe, and all other meetings beſides thoſe of which both time and place were limited, they cenſured for routs and riots and unlawful aſſemblies in the State, and in the Church for Conventicles.

Upon which our Author concludes, *p.* 229. It is not lawful no not for prayer, hearing, *&c.* for people to Aſſemble otherwiſe than by publick order is allowed.

But notwithſtanding this conceſſion our Author having diſtinguiſhed between times of corruption and incorruption, he ſays, *p.* 230. "That in "times of manifeſt corruptions and "perſecutions, wherein Religious aſ-"ſembling is dangerous, private "meetings, however beſides publick "Order, are not only lawful but they "are of neceſſity and duty. And this he ſuppoſeth a competent Plea as well for the Papiſts in our days as for the Proteſtants in Queen *Maries* dayes: "For elſe (ſaith he) how ſhall we ex-"cuſe the meetings of Chriſtians for "publick ſervice in time of danger "and perſecutions, and of our ſelves "in Queen *Maries* days? and how "will thoſe of the *Roman* Church "amongſt us put off the imputation of "Conventicling, who are known "amongſt us privately to aſſemble for "Religious exerciſe againſt all eſta-

"bliſhed

» bliſhed order both in Church and » State?— Now I willingly grant that in times of manifeſt corruptions and perſecutions, ſuch as the *Roman* and *Marian* were, private meetings are lawful and neceſſary duties; becauſe, if men do forbid what God hath commanded, it is better to obey God than man: But this rule will not hold with that Latitude which our Author annexeth to it, that ſuch meetings are lawful *however beſides publick order:* and *p.* 231. *however practiſed.* For ſuppoſe that *Diocleſian* or Queen *Mary* had publiſhed their Edicts that on ſuch days ſuch a number of Chriſtians or Proteſtants ſhould meet and worſhip God in publick places allowed them for that purpoſe, or as by the late Act of Parliament, any Family not admitting above five for Religious exerciſes were tolerated; it had been their duty to acquieſce in ſuch an Indulgence, and not by meeting in greater numbers and in places and times prohibited to provoke their Governors. For certainly God hath committed to the Soveraign authority a

power of regulating the External exercise of Divine Worship, nor can the irregularity of good men make void that Ordinance of God. And therefore our Author concludes amiss when he sayes, That all pious Assemblies in times of persecution and corruption, however practised, are indeed or rather alone the lawful congregations: and publick Assemblies though according to form of Law are indeed nothing else but Riots and Conventicles, if they be stained with corruption and superstition. A Doctrine that is very pleasing both to the Papists and other Sectaries, who being perswaded that we are corrupted and they are persecuted, may be incouraged once again to set up the good old Cause, that is, the overthrow of Monarchy and Episcopacy in this Nation, and the setting up of Popery and Anarchy in their rooms. Mr. *Hales* tells us in his Sermon on *Luke* 18. 1. *p.* 134. of his *Golden Remains*, that *Tully* observed that *Antony* the Orator being to defend a person who was accused of Faction and Sedition, bent his wits to

main-

maintain that *Sedition* was good, and not to be objected as a fault: our Author hath ſtrained his wits to do the like by *Schiſm*, and ſo far to excuſe ſeparation as ordinarily to lay the blame thereof upon *Superiors*, and to make them the Schiſmaticks as often as they endeavour to vindicate their authority in lawful things againſt ſuch, as find any *Scruples* againſt obedience to their commands. Which Mr. *Hales* ſhall Anſwer for me: *The taſte of Liberty is ſo ſweet, that except Kings maintain their Authority with as great violence, as the people affect their Liberty, all things will run to confuſion.* Sermon on *John* 18. 36. *p.* 149.

THE END.

Mr. BAXTER's

ARGUMENTS FOR Conformity, AGAINST SEPARATION:

BY WHICH

The most Material Parts OF *Mr. HALES's* TRACT of SCHISM ARE *CONFUTED.*

Every tender Conscience should be as tender of Church-division and real Schism, as of Drunkenness, Whoredom, or such other enormous Sins, *James* 3. 14, 15, 16, 17.

Mr. *Baxter's Reasons for Christian Religion*, p. 485. S. 34.

LONDON, Printed for *Walter Kettilby*, 1678.

Imprimatur,

C. Alston R. P. D.
Hen. *Epiſc. Lond.*
à Sacris Domeſticis.

TO THE READER

Concerning the Pretence OF *Conſcience for Separation.*

THE Conſcience of Man is a very ſacred thing; the great King hath made it his Chancellor to determine of ſuch caſes as are not plainly determinable by his Law, and hath given it a large Empire and Power to abſolve or condemn. Of this *Seneca* divinely informs his *Lucilius* (*Epiſt.* 41. *Ita dico, mi Lucili, ſacer intra nos ſpiritus ſedet, malorum bonorúmque noſtrorum obſervator, & cuſtos hic prout à nobis tractatus eſt, nos tractat*) There is a Sacred ſpirit reſiding within us obſerving and recording all our good and evil actions, and as this is dealt

dealt with by us, ſo it deals with us. If our Conſciences be firſt rightly informed, and then duly conſulted with and obeyed, there is not a ſafer Guide, a better Comforter, nor a more impartial Judge: for (it is *magni illius Judicii præjudicium*) as that acquits or condemns us, ſo *have we confidence towards God*, 1 *Jo.* 3. 20.

It ought therefore to be our great care that our hearts do not reproach us for any wilful tranſgreſſion of the Laws of God, or ſuch as he hath ſet over us, whom he hath required us to obey for Conſcience ſake.

And in the next place it is our duty tenderly to commiſerate ſuch weak Brethren whoſe Conſciences being really doubtful of the lawfulneſs of thoſe actions which are required of them, dare not obey till they obtain a *fiat* from them; but while they ſuſpend their duties are peaceable and faithful in the Land, and humbly and induſtriouſly ſeek for ſatisfaction from them whom God hath ſet over them. And truly I have not more Charity for many thorow Conformiſts, than for ſuch meek

meek and teachable Diſſenters. And I doubt not but their Rulers and Spiritual Fathers would deal with them in all gentleneſs and long-ſuffering, with familiar and eaſie methods to inform their judgments, and reconcile their affections to the knowledge and practice of the truth. But alas! how ſmall is the number of ſuch, among them that pretend conſcience, not in things doubtful and undetermined, but againſt plain and expreſs commands in the Laws of God and their Superiors, and under that pretence ſeek to be juſtified in notorious and ſcandalous impieties? Who can without indignation recount the horrible villanies and miſchiefs that have been acted in our Generation under this pretence? or who can ſufficiently deplore the contumacy and oppoſition of ſuch as pretend Conſcience againſt the means which God hath appointed for their information? The caſe ſeems to be well repreſented in the entertainment of the Angels among the *Sodomites*: (for Conſcience as an Angel of God is with a Commiſ-

ſion

ſion to ſave or to deſtroy) And in *Geneſis* 19. we read only of *Lot* who with great humility and reſpect met them, and bowing his Face to the ground, with great importunity preſſed them to take their repoſe with him; and he waſhed their Feet and feaſted them, and they delivered him from that great overthrow. But the Men of *Sodom*, old and young, from all quarters offered violence to them, and would have proſtituted them to their unnatural luſts. And do not they declare their ſin to be like that of *Sodom*, who ſtifle the good motions of this Guardian-Angel, and make it an inſtrument and Pander to their carnal luſts? inceſſantly abuſing it as the *Gibeathites* did the *Levites* Concubine, even to Death, *Judges* 19. And if a righteous *Lot* intercede for it, how do they reply as the *Sodomites* did, *This fellow is come to ſojourn, and he will needs be a Judge. Now will we deal worſe, with thee than with them, Gen.* 19. 9. But the puniſhment of the one ſhould make the other to tremble and do no more ſo wickedly, leſt thoſe Angels of Light leave

leave them in darkneſs, and rain ſomething moſt like to fire and brimſtone, even horror and deſpair into their Souls.

But beſide theſe wilful perſons there is a ſort of weak people among us, who have ſo intangled themſelves in nets of their own weaving, partly through ignorance, prejudice and evil education, and partly by melancholy and ſuperſtitious apprehenſions, fearing where no fear is, and taking their own fancies and ſhadows for Ghoſts and ſpectres, and laſtly by the dark ſuggeſtions of ſeducing ſpirits who deſpair of making any to be of their perſwaſion till they have frighted them out of their wits, that it is with them as ſometime it was with the people of *Rome* (*nec ferre vulnera poſſunt, nec remedia*) they can neither endure their wounds nor ſuffer the remedies. By their long ſtriving againſt their Prince, their Prieſts and their own Reaſon, they are ſo wounded and enſnared, that though their grievances be almoſt intolerable, yet they dread to diſcloſe them or to uſe

the

the advice of ſuch Phyſicians as upon their ſubmiſſion might through God's bleſſing heal and reſtore them. Every Quack that can adminiſter *Opium*, or ſtupifie the part affected, is more acceptable to them than a Colledge of able Phyſicians who diſcerning the cauſe could with more eaſie methods and at a cheaper rate cure their diſtempers. For the Nets that entangle moſt of theſe, are but like the ſpiders webs, ſtrong enough to captivate them out of whoſe bowels they were ſpun: But a man of reaſon may diſſipate them with the breath of his mouth. The Lion in the Fable was once thus intangled, and all his ſtrugling did but involve him more: yet when he was toyled and lay quiet, a very little Animal came and corroding the threads ſet the Royal Captive at liberty. There needs no great art if they would be patient and follow regular preſcripts, to reduce ſuch men to a ſenſe and enjoyment of their Chriſtian Liberty. If they would but follow the beſt of their own Leaders, two of which I have hereafter propoſed to them, their Arguments

guments and practices might ſoon undeceive them. For in truth it is not Conſcience but nice ſcruples, falſe opinions and prejudice and diſaffection to the Lawful Guides and Phyſicians of their Souls, and a fond admiration of ſome cunning perſons that lay in wait to enſnare them, and keep them in bondage, that they may make merchandiſe of them, which have ſo perplexed them. Can that be Conſcience that cauſeth men to ſtrain at a Gnat and ſwallow Camels? to ſtart at a ſhadow and throw themſelves over Precipices? ſo to abhor a Ceremony as to commit Sacriledge, and rob the Church of Chriſt of his laſt and beſt Legacy, that of Peace? Can Conſcience perſwade a man who confeſſeth his own ignorance (by his doubting) to judge of the things in controverſie, to conclude that his Superiors are in an error, and that they who diſobey and oppoſe them are in the right? or can we think that they did caſt themſelves out of their own Cures on a principle of Conſcience, who againſt all good Conſcience intruded upon other mens

and

and ſtill invade their rights? Is it Conſcience that teacheth them to interpret the actions and conſtitutions of their Superiors in the worſe ſenſe, and by their corrupt gloſſes to make faults where they can find none? Is it conſcience that cauſeth men who are under Oaths and obligations of obedience and peace, to withdraw cauſeleſly into factious and ſeditious aſſemblies to the diſturbance of the Church and State, where they might lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godlineſs and honeſty? Is it conſcience that teacheth men to ſcruple at Ceremonies, and to omit the weighty matters of the Law? Or can we think that they do really believe in their Conſciences that to live in Conformity to the Church of *England* is a ſin, who do educate their children (the care of whoſe Souls next to that of their own is incumbent on them,) in ſuch profeſſions as will neceſſarily engage them to be Conformiſts? The Ancient Nonconformiſts thought themſelves bound in Conſcience to uſe their utmoſt endeavours to prevent ſeparation from the

Church

Church of *England*, and to ingage their people to frequent the publick Worſhip. And can it be a point of Conſcience in the preſent Nonconformiſts ſo induſtriouſly to promote Separation, and as much as in them lyeth to bring the publick Worſhip into contempt? Or can they pretend conſcience for deſpiſing the prayers of the Church, who at the ſame time reject our Lords prayer alſo? Is it conſcience that makes private and illiterate men to think themſelves wiſer and better than their Rulers and ſpiritual Guides, whom God hath ſet over them? Is it conſcience that doth diſpenſe with the ſame men to conform and communicate with the Church when they are required to do ſo under ſome preſent and ſevere penalty (as on the late Teſt) and to ſhun it at other times? Laſtly, who can believe that they err through weakneſs or doubtfulneſs of Conſcience, who refuſe to make uſe of thoſe obvious and probable means for their ſatisfaction, which God hath appointed for them? That is, in ſuch doubtful caſes which their own

ſon cannot determine, to conſult with thoſe to whom God hath committed the conduct of their Souls. For what is Conſcience but a mans judgment concerning things and actions according to Gods Word, and Right Reaſon inlightned and directed thereby? For, ſeeing the Word of God hath not particularly determined of all things and actions, we ought by our Reaſon comparing one place of Scripture with another and drawing concluſions from them, to be guided and acted in ſuch things as are not determined in Scripture: and if our own Reaſon be too ſhort-ſighted and dull, to apprehend the nature of the things doubted of; we ought to uſe ſuch Inſtruments and helps as God hath provided, who hath ſaid by his Prophet, that *the Prieſts lips ſhould preſerve knowledge, and the people ſhould ſeek the Law at his mouth, for he is the meſſenger of the Lord of hoſts*, *Mal.* 2. 7. where the peoples duty is plainly aſſerted. And by his Apoſtle, that we ſhould *know them that are over us in the Lord*, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 12. And *Heb.* 13. 17. *Obey them that have the rule*

rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your Souls as they that muſt give account, &c. But as Mr. *Baxter* complains, *p.* 570. of his *Saints Reſt*, 'Few of the Godly themſelves 'do underſtand the Authority that 'their Teachers have over them from 'Chriſt, they know how to value the 'Miniſters Gifts but not how they are 'bound to learn of him and obey him 'becauſe of his office. — People are 'bound to obey and learn of their 'Teachers, as Scholars of their Maſters. And if the people were as willing to do their own duties, and as apt to learn of their Miniſters as they are forward to teach them, or blame them for not doing theirs, they might ſoon eaſe their Conſciences of much guilt as well as of many doubts and ſcruples, whereby for want of an humble and teachable ſpirit they ſo much trouble themſelves and others. And it is but reaſonable, that the eſtabliſhed Clergy of the Church of *England* ſhould expect as great a ſubmiſſion from their people as the *Worceſter* Miniſters who required their people to acknowledge

in these words: *I... do consent to be a Member of the particular Church of Christ at .... whereof .... is Teacher and Overseer, and to submit to his teaching and ministerial guidance and oversight according to God's Word.*

Those Men therefore whose Consciences are truly tender, ought in doubtful cases, to apply themselves to the means which God hath instituted (and will therefore most probably bless) for their information; as first, their own Pastor; or if he be thought defective, some neighbour Minister, of whom the doubting Person hath a good opinion for his parts and piety; if no such can remove his doubts, he seems to me to be a Person capable to read the Works of Learned men that have written of the things in controversie, and he may take in the help of Foreign Divines, and perhaps inquire into the practice of the Church in the most pure and primitive Ages. And if he find that they do all agree, as Mr. *Hooker* and Mr. *Baxter* say, That the certain commands of the Church we live in, are to be obeyed in all things

not

not certainly unlawful, I cannot think that ſuch as will ſtill pretend doubts, and eſpouſe Parties, and diſobey their Governors, and promote Schiſm and Diviſions, do erre out of weakneſs of Conſcience, but out of pride, and ſtubbornneſs, through great prejudices or for ſome little intereſts and concerns of their own, which they value more than the Peace of the Church.

Now that Man doth judge extremely uncharitably of his Rulers, whoſe Conſciences are as tender, and their Judgments better informed than his own, and who being at liberty to chooſe and propoſe what may moſt conduce, as well to their own, as the Peoples ſalvation, ſhall upon mature deliberation in ſolemn Aſſemblies appoint ſuch a Diſcipline and Rites as they think moſt agreeable to the Word of God and the practice of the pureſt Churches in all Ages; that Man, I ſay, muſt judge moſt uncharitably of them who ſhould think that they impoſe on him any thing that is unlawful, (without a very clear evidence of its unlawfulneſs) ſeeing that therein

they should not only wound their own Consciences and hazard their own Salvation, but draw upon themselves the guilt of the Peoples sins, by establishing iniquity by a Law, and incouraging the People to comply with it by their examples, and so like *Jeroboam* make the *Israel* of God to Sin.

But if in a deed done by a doubting Person, at the command of one that is indued with lawful authority, there be a sin, it must go on his score that requireth it wrongfully, not on his that doth but his duty in obeying; nor is the Salvation of an obedient subject hazarded by a peaceable compliance with his Superiors commands in such doubtful and disputable actions. Bishop *Sanderson* resolves a case that will put this out of doubt, Sermon on *Rom.* 14. 23. *p.* 92. 'A Prince commandeth his Subjects to serve in his 'Wars, it may be the quarrel is unjust, it may be there may appear to 'the understanding of the Subject great 'likelihoods of such injustice, yet may 'the subject for all that fight in the 'quarrel, yea he is bound in Conscience

'ence ſo to do, nay he is deep in diſ-
'loyalty and treaſon if he refuſe the
'ſervice, whatſoever pretenſions of
'Conſcience he may make for ſuch
'refuſal. Mr. *Baxter* ſpeaks almoſt as
much, *p.*461. of his Five *Diſputations*;
'Every War that is unlawfully under-
'taken by the Prince, is not unlawful
'in all his Souldiers. Some of them
'that have not opportunity to know
'the evil of his undertaking, may be
'bound to obey; the caſe of others I
'determine not. But a greater than
he (as I have ſhewn) hath determined
it, and the practice of the Primitive
Chriſtians, which ſtoutly fought the
Battels of Heathen Emperors, have
confirmed that determination. Now
it is worthy of our conſideration, to
think what manner of Souldiers ſuch
ſcrupulous Perſons would make in caſe
of a War begun againſt a juſt Prince
by ſome of his Subjects, that ſhould
pretend a Reformation of the Laws,
and arm themſelves to redreſs abuſes
in the adminiſtration of Juſtice, can
we think, that they who are apt to
diſobey upon I know not what ſcru-

ples of the lawfulneſs of innocent Rites and Ceremonies injoyned by his authority, will be ready to fight againſt their Brethren (that herein agree with them?) would they not rather ſide againſt him, (as their Predeceſſors have done?) I ſuppoſe there are very few that are ſcrupulouſly factious in the Church, but would in ſuch a caſe be ſeditious and rebellious in the State. I am ſure they would find more plauſible pretences, as, That the Prince commands ſuch things as are to their Conſciences unlawful, and that they durſt not ingage with him, leſt they draw innocent bloud upon their heads; they think they are rather bound to help the Lord's People againſt the Mighty, to rebuke even Kings for their ſakes, and if they ſee it meet; to bind their Kings with Chains and their Nobles with fetters of Iron, and to execute upon them the Judgment written: This Honour have all his Saints. And yet that learned Caſuiſt ſays, that the fears of ſuch ſcrupulous Perſons need not trouble them, no not in this grand caſe, leſt they ſhould

bring

bring upon themſelves the guilt of innocent bloud; for the bloud that is unrighteouſly ſhed in ſuch a quarrel, he muſt anſwer for, that ſet them on work, not he that ſpilt it. *Is damnum dat, qui jubet dare; ejus verò nulla culpa eſt, cui parére neceſſe eſt:* He doth the wrong that commands it to be done, not he whoſe obedience is a neceſſary duty. 'And truly (ſays the 'ſame Caſuiſt) it is a great wonder to 'me, that any Man endued with un'derſtanding, and that is able in any 'meaſure to weigh the force of thoſe 'precepts and reaſons which bind in'feriors to yield obedience to their Su'periors, ſhould be otherwiſe minded '*in caſes of like nature.* For whatſoever 'is commanded us by thoſe whom God 'hath ſet over us either in Church, 'Common-wealth or Family (*quod tamen non ſit certum diſplicere Deo*, as 'ſaith St. *Bernard*) which is not evi'dently contrary to the Law and Will 'of God, ought of us to be received 'and obeyed no otherwiſe than as if 'God himſelf had commanded it; be'cauſe God himſelf hath commanded

'us

'us to obey the higher Powers, and to 'ſubmit our ſelves to their Ordinances. And if theſe things ſhould not be ſo, either Government or Chriſtianity would in a ſhort time be rooted out as incompetent one with the other, for by ſuch Men Chriſt is really repreſented as an enemy to *Cæſar*; and the event will be, to have him crucified again in his members, and put to open ſhame.

THE

THE PREFACE To Mr. *BAXTER's* ARGUMENTS.

THE ſame wiſe and Gracious Providence of Almighty God which over-ruled the Actions of thoſe Armies that had kept us long in confuſion and made them inſtrumental for the ſetling of peace in the State, hath ſo directed the conſultations and publick tranſactions of ſuch as intruded on the affairs of the Church, that if they would practiſe according to their own principles, and acquieſce in their own arguments, we might ſee peace and unity eſtabliſhed alſo in the Church. For beſides the Arguments of the Nonconformiſts before 1642. who both by example and publick writings ſhewed their abhorrence of open Sepa-

ration,

ration, I do confidently affirm, that if there were a collection made of those reasons which were urged by the Presbyterians to prevent the other Factions from separating from them, as well in their Annotations, Assemblies, publick debates, Sermons, books of Schism, Separation, *&c.* there needed no other security to the people of this Nation, that they might with good Conscience conform to the publick Worship of God as it is now established. I have formerly published Mr. *Calvin's* arguments to this purpose, and now I present the Reader with Mr. *Baxter's*, not only because I thought them most rational and perswasive, but because I believe he was not acted by (a *studium partium*) any ambitious or private design, but intended them as an *Irenicum* to perswade peace and reconciliation between all sober dissenters. And I hope he will pardon me for prosecuting his own design, while I do it in his own words published in several Treatises since he first set forth his *Saints everlasting Rest*, in the Epistle to which he

he tells us he *ſhould fear of being a firebrand in Hell, if he ſhould be a firebrand in the Church.* I was much moved to ſee what *odium* he contracted from ſome of his Brethren, of whom he deſerved better things, for endeavouring to heal our diviſions; yet was he not aſhamed to write himſelf in the title page of his ſecond admonition to *Bagſhaw, a long-maligned and reſiſted endeavourer of the Churches unity and peace*; and in *pag.* 11. of that book, he thus declares his Chriſtian temper and reſolution, *If injuries or intereſt would excuſe any ſin, I think there are few Miniſters in* England *who have more inducement to the Angry ſeparating way than I have; But ſhall I therefore wrong the truth and Church of God and my own and others Souls? God forbid!* And page 52. he farther tells us --- *I repent that I no more diſcouraged the ſpirit of peeviſh quarrelling with Superiors and Church-orders, and (though I ever diſliked and oppoſed it, yet) that I ſometimes did too much incourage ſuch as were of their temper, by ſpeaking too ſharply againſt thoſe things which I thought to be Church corruptions,*

and

and was too loth to displeaſe the contentious for fear of being uncapable to do them good, (knowing the prophane to be much worſe than they) and meeting with too few religious perſons, that were not too much pleaſed with ſuch invectives. And as an Argument of his repentance, he defends himſelf againſt *Bagſhaw*, who objected that he choſe on *Eaſter* day to communicate in a very populous Church purpoſely that it might be known, ſaying, *p.* 76. *If a man by many years forbearing all publick prayers and Sacrament ſhould tempt others to think that he is againſt them or counts them needleſs, how ſhould he cure that ſcandal but by doing that openly pleading for it, which he is ſuppoſed to be againſt? Miniſters being bound to teach the people by Example as well as Doctrine, p.* 78. And what he practiſed himſelf he carefully perſwaded the people, to avoid ſeparation and hold communion in the parochial Churches. For the Queſtion which he maintained againſt *Bagſhaw* was--'It is lawful to hold com-'munion with ſuch Chriſtian Churches 'as have worthy or tolerable Paſtors, not with-

'notwithſtanding the Parochial order
'of them, and the Miniſters confor-
'mity and uſe of the Common Prayer-
'book: and with two limitations
concludes, *p.* 89. 'That we ought to
'do ſo when ſome ſpecial reaſons (as
'from Authority, ſcandal, *&c.*) do re-
'quire it. And whereas by theſe acti-
ons and writings, Mr. *Baxter* had ſo
provoked the diſſenting parties, that
it was objected, as himſelf intimates
in a ſecond objection, in the Preface
of his *Chriſtian Directory*, That his
writings differing from the common
judgment had already cauſed offence
to the Godly; in the fourth Anſwer,
he ſayes: 'If God bleſs me with oppor-
'tunity and help, I will offend ſuch
'men much more, by endeavour-
'ing further than ever I have done
'the quenching of that fire which
'they are ſtill blowing up, and de-
'tecting the folly and miſchief of thoſe
'Logomachies by which they militate
'againſt Love and Concord, and in-
'flame and tear the Church of God,
'and let them know that I am about
'it.

Theſe

These are resolutions becoming a Minister of Christ, an Ambassador of the Prince of Peace, taken up after long and serious deliberation, well rooted and fixed in his judgment and Conscience, by reason whereof he was enabled through the Grace of God to withstand manifold temptations and violent oppositions to the contrary. Nor can I think that such a man as Mr. *Baxter* can flee and desert so good a cause, and after Vows to make enquiry, and render himself guilty of all those calumnies and reproaches which his enemies have endeavoured to fix upon him: Nor can I think, that having brought our present controversies to so narrow a compass of ground, he will contribute to the building of a *Babel* upon it. This were to make good those hard speeches of Mr. *Bagshaw* against him, who tells us, *p.* 152. That one worthy of Credit told him that the Learned and Judicious Mr. *Herle* having read that cryed up book of his, said, It had been happy for the Church of God if Mr. *Baxter*'s friends had never sent him to School;

and

and that Mr. *Cawdry* had the ſame opinion of it. And that another perſon as knowing in the Myſtery of Godlineſs as either of them told a friend of his, that notwithſtanding the noiſe about him, Mr. *Baxter* would end in fleſh and bloud. And in a word, this would ſet home his own fears upon his ſpirit, that he might be a fire-brand in hell for being a fire-brand in the Church.

I ſhall therefore charitably believe, that though he ſeem to look another way, yet he is labouring to bring the people that adhere to him, to the harbour of Eccleſiaſtical peace and unity; that he doth ſtill preach up not holineſs only, but peace too, without which he knows no man ſhall ſee God; nor can I think that he doth now practiſe in contempt of Authority, what himſelf had condemned in others; or that he intends to harden the people in ſuch a Separation, as he had ſo long, ſo paſſionately, ſo rationally declaimed againſt. I rather hope that he hath ſome diſpenſation from his Lawful Superiors, and that by a

pia fraus having greator advantages of doing good put into his hands, he will by degrees improve them to the glory of God and the peace of this distracted Church.

If he drive any other design, I would desire him to consider, first, how he can Answer his own Arguments unto men; and secondly, how to give an account to God for his contrary practices.

But I have a very great confidence, that he who hath with great industry and faithfulness provided so many solid materials from the Scriptures and right reason for the supporting and beautifying a Temple of peace, having carved and guilded them over with serious Protestations of his own pacifick intentions, and variety of Rhetorick to perswade others, will not be a Leader of that rabble, which shall first break down the carved works with axes and hammers, and at last (though sore against his will) raze the very foundations, and cry Down with it, down with it even to the ground.

Of

Of the Church.

Mr. Baxter *in his Reasons for the Christian Religion*, p. 464.

S. 2. THE Church of Christ being his Body is but one, and hath many parts, but should have no Parties, but unity and concord without Division.

S. 3. Therefore no Christian must be of a Party or Sect as such, that is, as dividing it self from the rest, causing Schism or Contention in the Body, or making a rent unnecessarily in any particular Church which is a part.

S. 8. Nothing will warrant us to separate from a Church as no Church, but the want of something essential to a Church.

S. 11. It is essential to particular Political Churches, that they be constituted of true Bishops or Pastors and of Flocks of baptized or professed Christians, united for holy Communion in

the worſhipping of God, and the promoting of the Salvation of the ſeveral Members.

*S.*12. It is eſſential to a true Biſhop or Paſtor of the Church to be in office (that is in authority and obligation) appointed by Chriſt in Subordination to him in the three parts of his offices, Prophetical, Prieſtly and Kingly. That is, to teach the People, to ſtand between them and God in Worſhip, and to guide or govern them by the Paternal exerciſe of the Keys of his Church.

*S.*15. If a Church which in all other reſpects is pureſt and beſt, will impoſe any ſin upon all that will have any local Communion with it, though we muſt not ſeparate from that Church as no Church, yet muſt we not commit that ſin, but patiently ſuffer them to exclude us from their Communion.

Of the Doctrine of the Church of England.

Preface to 9. Diſput. p. 6. As for the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, the Biſhops and their Followers from the firſt Reformation begun

gun by King *Edward* the Sixth, were found in Doctrine, adhering to the *Auguſtane* method expreſſed now in the Articles and Homilies; they differed not in any conſiderable point from thoſe whom they called *Puritans*, but it was in the form of Government, Liturgy and Ceremonies that the difference lay.

The *Independents* as well as the *Preſbyterians* offer to Subſcribe the XXXIX Articles as diſtinct from Prelacy and Ceremony. And when I was in the Country, I knew not of one Miniſter to ten that are now ſilenced, that was not in the main of the ſame Principles with my ſelf. *Defence of principles of love, p. 64.*

Mr. Baxter's *Reaſons for Obedience in Lawful things*, page 483. *of his five Diſputations.*

§. 1. LEST Men that are apt to run from one extream into another, ſhould make an ill uſe of that which I have before written, I ſhall

here annex ſome Reaſons to perſwade Men to juſt obedience, and preſerve them from any ſinful nonconformity to the commands of their Governours, and the evil effects that are like to follow thereupon.

§. 2. But firſt I will lay together ſome Propoſitions for deciſion of the Controverſie; How far we are bound to obey Mens Precepts about Religion? Eſpecially in caſe we doubt of the lawfulneſs of obeying them? and ſo cannot obey them in faith?

§. 3. Briefly: 1. We muſt obey both Magiſtrates and Paſtors in all things lawful which belong to their offices to command. 2. It belongs not to their office to make God a new worſhip; But to command the Mode and Circumſtances of worſhip belongeth to their office: for guiding them wherein God hath given them general rules. 3. We muſt not take the Lawful commands of our Governours to be unlawful. 4. If we do through weakneſs or perverſneſs take Lawful things to be unlawful, that will not excuſe us in our diſobedience. Our error is

our

our ſin, and one ſin will not excuſe another ſin. Even as on the other ſide, if we judge things unlawful to be lawful, that will not excuſe us for our diſobedience to God in obeying men. 5. As I have before ſhewed, many things that are miſcommanded, muſt be obeyed. 6. As an erroneous judgment will not excuſe us from Obedience to our Governours, ſo much leſs will a *doubtfulneſs* excuſe us. 7. As ſuch a doubting, erring judgment cannot obey in (plenary) faith, ſo much leſs can he diſobey in faith. For it is a known Command of God, that *we obey them that have the Rule over us*: but they have no word of God againſt the act of obedience now in queſtion. It is their own erring judgment that intangleth them in a neceſſity of ſinning (till it be changed.) 7. In doubtful caſes, it is our duty to uſe God's means for our information: and one means is to conſult with our Teachers, and hear their words with teachableneſs and meekneſs. 8. If upon adviſing with them we remain in doubt about the lawfulneſs of ſome Circum-

ſtance of order, if it be ſuch as may be diſpenſed with, they ſhould diſpenſe with us: if it may not be diſpenſed with without a greater injury to the Church or cauſe of God, than our diſpenſation will countervail, then is it our duty to obey our Teachers, notwithſtanding ſuch doubts: For it being their office to Teach us, it muſt be our duty to believe them with a humane faith, in caſes where we have no Evidences to the contrary: And the Duty of Obeying them being certain, and the ſinfulneſs of the thing commanded being uncertain & unknown, and only ſuſpected, we muſt go on the ſurer ſide. 9. Yet muſt we in great and doubtful caſes, not take up with the ſuſpected judgment of a ſingle Paſtor, but apply our ſelves to the unanimous Paſtors of other Churches. 10. Chriſtians ſhould not be over-buſie in prying into the work of their Governours, nor too forward to ſuſpect their determinations: But when they know that it is their Rulers work to guide them by determining of due Circumſtances of worſhip, they ſhould with-

without cauſleſs ſcruples readily obey, till they ſee juſt reaſon to ſtop them in their obedience; They muſt not go out of their own places to ſearch into the Actions of another Man's office, to trouble themſelves without any cauſe.

§. 4. And now I intreat all humble Chriſtians readily to obey both Magiſtrates and Paſtors in all lawful things; and to conſider, to that end, of theſe Reaſons following. *Reaſ.* 1. If you will not obey in Lawful things, you deny authority, or overthrow Government it ſelf, which is a great ordinance of God, eſtabliſhed in the fifth Commandment with promiſe: And as that commandment reſpecting ſocieties and common good, is greater than the following commands, as they reſpect the private good of our neighbours, or are but particular means to that Publick good, whoſe foundation is laid in the fifth commandment; ſo accordingly the ſin againſt this fifth commandment muſt be greater than that againſt the reſt.

§. 5. *Reaſ.* 2. In diſobeying the lawful

ful commands of our Superiors, we disobey Christ, who ruleth by them as his officers. Even as the disobeying a Justice of Peace or Judge is a disobeying of the soveraign Power; yea in some cases when their sentence is unjust. Some of the ancient Doctors thought that the fifth commandment was the last of the first Table of the Decalogue; and that the Honouring of Governors is part of our Honour to God, they being mentioned there as his officers, with whom he himself is honoured or dishonoured, obeyed or disobeyed: For it is God's Authority that the Magistrate, Parent, and Pastor is endued with, and empowred by to rule those that are put under them.

§. 6. Reas. 3. What confusion will be brought into the Church if Pastors be not obeyed in things lawful? For instance: If the Pastors appoint the Congregation to Assemble at one hour, and the People will scruple the time, and say, it is unlawful, and so will choose some of them one time, and some another, what disorder will here be? and worse, if the Pastors appoint

a

a Place of worſhip, and any of the People ſcruple obeying them, and will come to another place, what confuſion will here be? People are many, and the Paſtors are few: and therefore there may be ſome unity if the People be Ruled by the Paſtors; but there can be none, if the Paſtors muſt be ruled by the People, for the People will not agree among themſelves: and therefore if we obey one part of them, we muſt diſobey and diſpleaſe the reſt. And their ignorance makes them unfit to rule.

§. 7. *Reaſ.* 4. Moreover, diſobedience in matters of *Circumſtance*, will exclude and overthrow the *ſubſtance* of the worſhip it ſelf. God commandeth us to pray: If one part of the Church will not joyn with a ſtinted form of Prayer, and the other part will not joyn without it, both Parties cannot be pleaſed, and ſo one part muſt caſt off Prayer it ſelf, or ſeparate from the reſt. God commandeth the reading, and preaching, and hearing of the Scripture, and the ſinging of Pſalms: but he hath left it to Man to make or chooſe the beſt

Tranſla-

Translation of Scripture, or version of the Psalms. Now if the Pastor appoint one version and Translation, and the Church joyn in the use of it, if any members will scruple joyning in this Translation or version, they must needs forbear the whole duty of Hearing the Scripture, and singing Psalms in that Congregation. If they pretend a scruple against the appointed time or place of worship, they will thereby cast off the worship it self. For if they avoid our *Time* or *Place*, they cannot meet with us, nor worship with us.

§. 8. *Reas.* 5. And when they are thus carried to separate from the Congregation, upon such grounds as these, they will be no where fixt, but may be still subdividing, and separating from one another, till they are resolved into individuals, and have left no such thing as a Church among them. For they can have no assurance or probability, that some of themselves will not dissent from the rest in one Circumstance or other, as they did from their Pastors and the Church that they were of before.

§. 9.

§. 9. *Reaſ.* 6. By this means the wicked that are diſobedient to their Teachers, and reject the worſhip of God it ſelf, will be hardened in their ſin, and taught by Profeſſors to defend their ungodlineſs: For the very ſame courſe that you take will ſerve their turns. They need not deny any Duty in the ſubſtance, but deny the circumſtance, and ſo put off the ſubſtance of the Duty. If a wicked man will not hear the word preached, he may ſay [*I am not againſt preaching; but I am unſatisfied of the lawfulneſs of your Time or Place, I am in judgment againſt coming to your Steeple-houſe, or againſt the Lords Day.*] And ſo he ſhall never hear, though he ſay he is for hearing. If a wicked man will not be perſonally inſtructed, or admoniſhed, or be accountable to the Church or Paſtors for any ſcandals of his life, nor ſubmit to any diſcipline, he may ſay [*I am for diſcipline, I know it is my duty to be inſtructed: but I am not ſatisfied that I am bound to come to you when you ſend for me, or to appear at ſuch a place as you appoint: the word of God nameth no time or place, and*

you

you ſhall not deprive me of my liberty.] If a wicked Man would not hear or read the Scripture, or ſing Pſalms, he may ſay that he is for the duty, but he is only againſt this and that Tranſlation and verſion: And ſo while every verſion is excepted againſt, the duty is as much evaded as if it were denied it ſelf. By this device it is that the Rebellion of unruly People is defended: They run to the *circumſtances* of the duty, and ask, [Where are they bound to come to a Miniſter? or to be examined by him in order to a baptiſm or Lords ſupper? or to ſpeak their conſent to be Church-members, or to ſubſcribe to a Profeſſion, or to read an Engliſh Bible, or to hear in a Steeple-houſe, with many ſuch like.] Thus alſo it is that they put off Family-prayer, and ask, [*Where are they bound to pray in their Family Morning and Evening?*] and ſo keep no conſtancy in Family-prayer at all, under pretence of denying only the circumſtances.

Q. 10. *Reaſ.* 7. By this diſobedience in things lawful, the members of

of the Church will be involved in contentions, and ſo ingaged in bitter uncharitableneſs, and cenſures, and perſecutions, and reproaches of one another: which ſcandalous courſes will nouriſh vice, diſhonour God, rejoyce the enemies, grieve the Godly that are peaceable and judicious, and wound the conſciences of the contenders. We ſee the beginning of ſuch fires are ſmall, but whither they tend, and what will be the end of them, we ſee not.

Q. 11. *Reaſ.* 8. By theſe means alſo Magiſtrates will be provoked to take men of tender conſciences for factious, unruly, and unreaſonable men, and to turn their enemies, and uſe violence againſt them, to the great injury of the Church: when they ſee them ſo ſelf-conceited, and refuſing obedience in lawful circumſtances.

Q. 12. *Reaſ.* 9. By this means alſo the converſion and eſtabliſhment of ſouls will be much hindred, and people poſſeſſed with prejudice againſt the Church and ordinances, when they take us to be but humorous people, and

and ſee us in ſuch contentions among our ſelves. To my knowledge, our late difference about ſome ſuch leſſer things, hath turned off, or hindered abundance of people from liking the holy doctrine and life which we profeſs.

Q. 13. *Reaſ.* 10. It will ſeem to the wiſeſt, to ſavour of no ſmall meaſure of *Pride*, when people on the account of lawful circumſtances, dare ſet themſelves againſt their Governors and Teachers, and quarrel with the Ordinances of God, and with the Churches: Humble men would ſooner ſuſpect themſelves, and quarrel with their own diſtempers, and ſubmit to thoſe that are wiſer than themſelves, and that are ſet over them for their guidance by the Lord. There may more dangerous *Pride* be manifeſted in theſe matters, than in Apparel, and ſuch lower trifles.

Q. 14. *Reaſ.* 11. Conſider alſo what yielding in things lawful the Scripture recommendeth to us? How far yielded *Paul* when he circumciſed *Timothy?* Act 16. 3. And when he

[took

[*took the men, and purified himſelf with them in the Temple, to ſignifie the accompliſhment of the days of purification, until that an offering ſhould be offered for every one of them*] and this for almoſt ſeven dayes, *Acts* 21. 26, 27. with the foregoing verſes.

Q. 15. So 1 Cor. 9. 19, 20. [*For though I be free from all men, yet have I made my ſelf ſervant unto all, that I might gain the more: And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the Law, as under the Law, that I might gain them that are under the Law: To them that are without Law, as without Law (being not without Law to God, but under the Law to Chriſt) that I might gain them that are without Law. To the weak I became as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might, by all means ſave ſome, and this I do for the Goſpels ſake, &c.*] Study this example.

Q. 16. Read alſo *Rom.* 14. *and* 15. Chapters, how much condeſcenſion the Apoſtle requireth even among equals, about meats and dayes. And 1 *Cor.* 8. 13. the Apoſtle would tie up

himſelf from eating any fleſh while the world ſtandeth, rather than make a weak brother to offend. Many other paſſages of Scripture require a condeſcenſion in things of this indifferent nature, and ſhew that the Kingdom of God doth not conſiſt in them.

Q. 17. And *Matthew* 12. 1, 2, *to* 9. you find that hunger juſtified the Diſciples of Chriſt for plucking and rubbing the ears of Corn on the Sabbath dayes. And hunger juſtified *David* and thoſe that were with him, for entring into the houſe of God, and eating the ſhew-bread, which was not lawful for him to eat, nor for them which were with him, but only for the Prieſts: And the Prieſts in the Temple were blameleſs for prophaning the Sabbath day.] Now if things before accidentally evil, may by this much Neceſſity become lawful and a duty, then may the commands of Magiſtrates or Paſtors, and the Unity of the Church, and the avoiding of contention, and offence, and other evils, be alſo ſufficient to warrant us in obeying, even in inconvenient Circum-

cumſtantials of the worſhip of God, that otherwiſe could not be juſtified.

Q. 18. *Reaſ.* 12. Laſtly conſider, how much God hath expreſſed himſelf in his word to be pleaſed in the *Obedience* of believers. Not only in their Obedience to Chriſt immediately, but alſo to him in his officers, 1 *Sam.* 15. 22. [*Behold to obey is better than Sacrifice*, &c.] Col. 3. 20, 22. [*Children obey your Parents in all things* (that is, all lawful things) *for this is well-pleaſing to the Lord*] [*Servants Obey in all things your Maſters according to the fleſh*, *&c.*] And Obedience to Paſtors is as much commanded, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12, 13. [*We beſeech you brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admoniſh you, and eſteem them very highly*, &c.] Heb. 13. 17. [*Obey them that have the rule over you, and ſubmit your ſelves, for they watch for your ſouls as they that muſt give account*, &c.] So *Verſe* 7. & 24. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17, &c.

Q. 19. As the General Commiſſion to a Parent, or Maſter, or Magiſtrate to Govern their inferior relations, doth

authorize them to many particular acts belonging to their office, that were never named in their commission: so your general command to obey them, obligeth you to obey them in the said particulars. And so it is also betwixt the Pastors and the flock, in matters belonging to the office of a Pastor.

Q. 20. If a Child shall ask a Parent, [*Where doth Gods word allow you to command me to learn this Catechism, or read this Divines writings, or repeat this Sermon, or write it?* &c.] doth not the question deserve to be answered with the rod? The General Commission for Parents to Govern their children is sufficient. So if a Schoolmaster command his Scholars to come to such a place to School, and to take their places in such an Order, and to learn such books, and do such exercises, *&c.* the General Commission that he hath to teach and Govern them, will allow him to do all this. (Though it will not allow him to set his Scholars to any Artifice or Manual Operation alien to his profession.) So if a Minister determine of the variable Circum-

cumſtances of worſhip, as what place the people ſhall come to, and at what time, to be Catechized, examined, inſtructed, &c. what Tranſlation or Verſion of Pſalms to uſe, what Utenſils to make uſe of about Gods ſervice, or ſuch like, he is warranted for this by his *General* Commiſſion. And if he miſs it in the manner, by chooſing inconvenient circumſtances, or by unneceſſary determination of points that ſhould rather be left undetermined to liberty, though this be his own ſin, it will not excuſe the people from obedience; unleſs the error of his directions be ſo great as would fruſtrate the Ordinance it ſelf, or do more harm than our diſobedience would do; which in Circumſtantials is rarely found.

By long experience I am aſſured, that practical religion, will afford both to Church, State, and Conſcience more certain, and more ſolid peace, than contending diſputers, with all their pretences of Orthodoxneſs, and zeal againſt errors, for the truth, will ever bring, or did ever attain to. *Preface to Chriſtian Direct.* ad finem.

Wherefore let us consider in the next place,

The Mischief of Separation.

Epistle Dedicatory to Saints Rest.

The mischief of Separation lies not in the bare error of judgment, but in the unchristian and Church-dissolving division and alienation, which thence followeth; contrary to that humility and love, which is the visible character of Christians, and to that Oneness, which is still in Scripture ascribed to the visible Church. Alas, that pride and ignorance should have such power among believers, that men cannot be of several judgments in lesser points, but they must needs be of several Churches. God will make us value peace and union a little more, before we shall taste of the perfect everlasting peace and union; yea before we shall see the blessing of union in the Church. Wounding is a dividing, healing is a re-uniting; a Building is of many stones or pieces orderly conjoyned; a Church is an aggregation of individuals, an association

ciation of Believers: what then is it to demoliſh, but to ſeparate and disjoyn? and what is it to diſſolve Churches, but to break their aſſociation, to reduce them to individuals, to cut them into ſhreds?

As for the differences in way of Government, between the moderate *Presbyterians*, *Independants*, *Epiſcopal*, and *Eraſtian*, I make no doubt, but if mens ſpirits ſtood not at a greater diſtance than their principles, they would quickly be united. But of all the four ſorts there are ſome that run ſo high in their principles, that they run out of the hearing of peace or truth. For *Anabaptiſm* and *Antinomianiſm* God ſpake effectually againſt them, by thoſe wondrous Monſters in *New-England*; but wonders are over-lookt, where the heart is hardned, and God intends to get his juſtice a name. The fearful deluſions, that God hath formerly given them over to, and the horrid confuſion which they have introduced where they have ſprung, hath ſpoken fully againſt both theſe later Sects. The weeping eyes,

the bleeding sides, the lacerated members of these Churches, the reproach of the Gospel, the disappointed Reformation, the hideous doctrines, and unheard of wickedness that hath followed them, the contemned ordinances, the reproached, slandered, and ejected Ministers, the weak that are scandalized, the Professors apostatized, the wicked hardned, and the open enemies of the Gospel, that now insult; all these do describe them more plainly to *England*, than words can do, and cry loud in the ears of God, and man. What will be the Answer, time will shew: but from *Rev.* 2. 14, 15, 16, *&c.* we may probably conjecture.

He that is not a Son of peace, is not a Son of God. All other sins destroy the Church consequentially, but division and Separation demolish it directly. Building the Church is but an orderly joyning of the materials, and what then is disjoyning but pulling down? Many doctrinal differences must be tolerated in a Church, and why, but for unity and peace? therefore

fore diſunion and ſeparation is utterly intolerable. Believe not thoſe to be the Churches friends, that would cure and reform her by cutting her throat. Thoſe that ſay, no truth muſt be concealed for peace, have uſually as little of the one as the other. Study *Gal.* 2. 22. *Rom.* 14. 1. *Acts* 21. 24, 26. 1 *Tim.* 1. 4. & 6. 4. *Titus* 3. 8, 9. I hope, ſad experience ſpeaks this leſſon to your very hearts, if I ſhould ſay nothing. Do not your hearts bleed to look upon the State of *England*, and to think how few Towns, or Cities there be (where is any forwardneſs in Religion) that are not cut into ſhreds and crumbled as to duſt, by ſeparations and diviſions? to think what a wound we have hereby given to the very Chriſtian name, how we have hardned the ignorant, confirmed the Papiſts, and are our ſelves become the ſcorn of our enemies, and the grief of our friends, and how many of our deareſt beſt eſteemed friends, have fallen to notorious pride or impiety, yea, ſome, to be worſe than open Infidels? Theſe are pillars of Salt, ſee

that

that you remember them. Though of your own ſelves, men ſhould ariſe, ſpeaking perverſe things, to draw diſciples after them, *Acts* 20. 30. yea though an Angel from Heaven ſhould draw you to diviſions, ſee that you follow him not. If there be erroneous practices in the Church, keep your ſelves innocent, with moderation, and peace. It muſt be no ſmall error, that muſt force a Separation. *Juſtin Martyr* profeſſed, that if a *Jew* ſhould keep the ceremonial law, ſo he did not perſwade the *Gentiles* to it, as neceſſary, yet if he acknowledged Chriſt, he judgeth that he might be ſaved, and he would imbrace him and have communion with him. *Paul* would have him received, that is weak in the faith, and not un-church whole pariſhes of thoſe that we know not, nor were ever brought to a juſt trial. I ever loved a godly peaceable Conformiſt, better than a turbulent Nonconformiſt. I differ from many, in ſeveral things of conſiderable moment, yet if I ſhould zealouſly preſs my judgment on others, ſo as to diſturb the

the peace of the Church, and ſeparate from my brethren that are contrary minded, I ſhould fear, leſt I ſhould prove a fire-brand in hell, for being a fire-brand in the Church. And for all the intereſt I have in your judgments and affections, I here charge you, that if God ſhould give me up, to any factious, Church-rending courſe, (againſt which I daily pray) that you forſake me, and follow me not a ſtep. And for peace with one another, follow it with all your might, *if it be poſſible, as much as in you lyeth, live peaceably with all men, Rom.* 12. 18. (mark this.) When you feel any ſparks of diſcontent in your breaſts, take them as kindled by the Devil, from hell and take heed you cheriſh them not. If the flames begin to break forth, in cenſoriouſneſs, reproaches, and hard ſpeeches of others, be as ſpeedy and buſie in quenching it, as if it were fire in the thatch of your houſes. For why ſhould your houſes be dearer to you, than the Church, which is the houſe of God? or your Souls, which are the Temples of the Holy Ghoſt?

Hath

Hath God ſpoke more againſt any ſin than unpeaceableneſs? If ye forgive not men their treſpaſſes, neither will your heavenly Father forgive you: which *Lodovicus Grocius* ſays, is the meaſure, and eſſential property of the leaſt degree of true faith; if you love not one another, you are not diſciples of Chriſt.

Saints Reſt p. 551. Publick wars and private quarrels uſually pretend the Reformation of the Church, the vindicating of the Truth, and the welfare of Souls; but they as uſually prove in the iſſue, the greateſt means to the overthrow of all. It is as natural for both wars and private contentions to produce errors, ſchiſms, contempt of Magiſtracy, Miniſtry, and Ordinances, as it is for a dead Carrion to breed worms and vermine. Believe it from one, that hath too many years experience of it; it is as hard a thing to maintain even in your people, a ſound underſtanding, a tender Conſcience, a lively, gracious, heavenly frame of ſpirit, and an upright life in a way of war and contention, as to keep your Candle lighted

in

in the greateſt ſtorms, or under the waters. The like I may ſay of perverſe and fierce diſputings about the circumſtantials of diſcipline, or other queſtions, that are far from the foundation; they oftner loſe the truth than find it. Wo to thoſe Miniſters, that make unneceſſary diviſions, and parties among the people, that ſo they may get themſelves a name, and be cryed up by many followers. The way to proſper your labours is to quench all flames of contention, to your power. Study the peace and unity of your Congregations, keep out all occaſions of diviſions, eſpecially the doctrine of Separation, and popular Church-Government, the apparent Seminary of faction, and perpetual contentions. If once the people be taught, that it belongs to them to govern themſelves, and thoſe the Scripture calleth their Guides and Rulers, we ſhall have mad work. They that would pluck up the hedge of Government, as if the vineyard could not be fruitful, except it lay waſte, to the pleaſure of all the beaſts of the foreſt,

foreſt, are like the pond, that grudged at the banks and damm, and thought it injurious to be reſtrained of its liberty, and therefore combined with the winds, to raiſe a tempeſt, and ſo aſſault and beat down the banks in their rage; and now where is that peaceable aſſociation of waters? We feel now, how thoſe are miſtaken that thought the way for the Churches unity, was to dig up the banks and let all looſe, that every man in Religion might do what he liſt.

p. 666. ℘ They are, uſually, men leaſt acquainted with a heavenly life, who are the violent diſputers about the circumſtantials of Religion. As the body doth languiſh in conſuming Fevers, when the native heat abates within, and unnatural heat inflaming the external parts ſucceeds: ſo when the zeal of a Chriſtian doth leave the internals of Religion, and fly to ceremonials, externals, or inferior things, the Soul muſt needs conſume and languiſh.

Of

Of Conformity.

For Conformity, though to Miniſters it be another thing, by reaſon of the new impoſitions, than it was to our Predeceſſors; yet to the People, Conformity is the ſame, if not eaſier, (eſpecially to them that I now ſpeak to:) for it is the Liturgy, Ceremonies, and Miniſtry, that moſt alienate them. And the Liturgy is a little amended, as to them, by the change of the tranſlation, and ſome little words, and by ſome longer Prayers; and the Ceremonies are the ſame; and thirty years ago, there were many bare reading, not preaching Miniſters, for one that is now. Therefore our caſe of Separation being the ſame as of old, I take it to be fully confuted, by the Ancient Non-conformiſts: and I have ſo great a veneration for the worthy Names, much more an eſtimation of the reaſonings, of Mr. *Cartwright*, *Egerton*, *Hilderſham*, *Dod*, *Ameſius*, *Parker*, *Baines*, *Brightman*, *Ball*, *Bradſhaw*, *Paget*, *Langley*, *Nicols*, *Herring*, *&c.* that I ſhall not think, p. 55.

think, they knew not why they choſe this ſubject, and wrote more againſt Separation, than the Conformiſts did. I am very glad that the pious Lectures of Mr. *Hilderſham*, Mr. *R. Rogers*, and ſuch old Non-conformiſts, are in ſo good eſteem among good People, where they will read them, urging the People, not only againſt Separation, but to come to the very beginning of the publick Worſhip, and preferring it before their private duties.

P. 57. When I think what holy Learned Men the old Conformiſts were, my heart riſeth againſt the thoughts of ſeparating from them. If I had come to their Churches, when they uſed the Common Prayer, and adminiſtred the Sacrament, could I have departed and ſaid, It is not lawful for any Chriſtian here to communicate with you? What! to ſuch Men, as Mr. *Bolton*, *Whateley*, *Fenner*, *Dent*, *Crook*, *Dike*, *Stock*, *Smith*, Dr. *Preſton*, *Sibbs*, *Stoughton*, *Taylor*, and abundance other ſuch? yea ſuch as Biſhop *Jewel*, *Grindal*, *Hall*, *Potter*, *Davenant*, *Carleton*, *&c.* Dr. *Field*, *Smith*, *Jo. White*, *Willet*, *&c.* yea

and

and the Martyrs too? as *Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper* himſelf, *Farrar, Bradford, Fillpot, Sanders, &c.* Could I ſeparate from all theſe on the Reaſons now in queſtion? Yea *Calvin* himſelf and the Churches of his way were all ſeparated from by the Separatiſts of their times.

And though miniſterial Conformity is now much altered, (as to ingagements) many (of the Aſſembly of Divines) that are yet living, do conform again; nor would I ſhun communion with the Reverend members of that Aſſembly, *Twiſs, Gataker, Whitaker,* and the reſt, if again they uſed the Liturgy among us. And if the old Conformiſts, ſuch as *Bolton, &c.* were alive, and uſed now the ſame Liturgy and Ceremonies as they did then, (which was worſe than now) I could not think their communion in Prayer and Sacraments, unlawful, nor cenſure that man as injurious to the Church, who ſhould write to perſwade others, not to ſeparate from them. p. 12, 13.

Read over ſome of the old Non-conformiſts Books againſt Separation, as *Defenſe,* p. 89.

Mr. *Jacobs*, the Independent, againſt *Johnſon*, and Mr. *Bradſhaw*, and Mr. *Gataker*'s defence againſt *Cann*, Mr. *Gifford*, *Darrell*, *Paget*, *&c.* and fulleſt of all, (at the beginning of our troubles) Mr. *John Ball* in three Books: In theſe you will find the ſame objections anſwered, or more, and greater. And I profeſs my judgment, That our ordinary boaſters, that think they know more in this controverſie than the old Non-conformiſts did, as far as I am able to diſcern, are as far below them almoſt as they are below either *Chamier*, *Sadeel*, *Whitaker*, or ſuch other in dealing with a Papiſt.

Objections Anſwered.

Chriſtian Directory, P. 747.

But what if there be groſs and ſcandalous ſinners are members of the Church? Anſw. If you be wanting in your duty to reform it, it is your ſin; but if bare preſence made their ſin to be ours, it would alſo make all the ſins of the Aſſembly ours.

But what if they are ſins committed in the open Aſſembly, even by the Miniſter him-

himself in his praying, preaching, and other administrations? Answ. 1. A Ministers personal faults may damn himself, and must be matter of lamentation to the Church, who ought to do their best to reform them, or get better, by any lawful means; But in case they cannot, his sin is none of theirs, nor doth it make his administration null, or ineffectual, nor will it allow you to separate from the Worship which he administreth.---You may not separate from him, unless you can prove him, or his ministry, utterly intolerable, by such faults as these: 1. An utter insufficiency in knowledge, or utterance, for the necessary parts of the ministerial work: As if he be not able to teach the necessary points of Christian Religion, nor to administer the Sacraments, and other parts of publick Worship. 2. If he set himself to oppose the ends of his Ministry, and preach down godliness, or any part of it, that is necessary to Salvation: Or be a Preacher of heresie, preaching up any damning error or preaching down any necessary, saving truth. 3. If he so deprave the

publick Worſhip, as to deſtroy the ſubſtance of it, as in putting up blaſphemy for prayer or praiſe, or commit idolatry, or ſet up new Sacraments, or impoſe any actual ſin on the People.

See *Chriſt. Direct.* p. 606.

But there are other miniſterial faults, which warrant not our Separation; as 1. Some tolerable errors of judgment, or envy, and pettiſh oppoſition to others, *Phil.* 1. 15. 2. It is not unlawful to join with a Miniſter, that hath many defects in his miniſtration, or manner of Worſhip; as if he preach with ſome ignorance, diſorder, unfit expreſſions, or geſtures, and the like in Prayer and Sacraments. 3. It is not unlawful to join with a Miniſter, that hath ſome material error or untruth in preaching or praying, ſo be it we be not called to approve it, and ſo it be not pernicious and deſtructive to the ends of his miniſtry. If we run away from all that vent any untruth or miſtake in publick or private worſhip, we ſhall ſcarce know, what Church or Perſon we may hold communion with. For 1. A ſmall ſin may no more be done or owned, than a greater. 2. And then

another

another man's weakneſs, may diſoblige me, and diſcharge me from my duty.

Of Subſcription with Aſſent and conſent, particularly concerning Infants baptized.

Q. 152. *Is it lawful to ſubſcribe or profeſs full aſſent and conſent to any religious books, beſide the Bible, ſeeing all are fallible?* 3. *Anſw.* It is lawful to profeſs or ſubſcribe our aſſent and conſent to any humane writing, which we judge to be true and good, according to the meaſure of its truth and goodneſs. As if Church-confeſſions, that are ſound, be offered us, for our conſent, we may ſay, or ſubſcribe, I hold all the Doctrine in this book to be true and good. *Chriſt. Diſcuſſ. p. 902.*

Q. 35. *Is it certain by the Word of God, that all Infants baptized, and dying before actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved?* *Anſw.* I think that all the children of true Chriſtians do by baptiſm receive a publick inveſtiture, by God's appointment, into a ſtate of remiſſion, adoption, and right to ſalvation, at preſent; p. 807. p. 810.

ſent; though I dare not ſay, I am undoubtedly certain of it.---But I ſay, as the Synod of *Dort*, *Art.* 1. That believing Parents have no cauſe to doubt of the ſalvation of their children, that dye in infancy, before they commit actual ſin; that is, not to trouble themſelves with fears about it. For if ſuch Infants were admitted to outward priviledges only, then (which is my 2*d.* Reaſon) we have no promiſe, or certainty or ground of Faith for the pardon and ſalvation of any individual Infants in the World: and if there be no promiſe, there is no faith of it, nor no baptiſm to ſeal it, and ſo we make Antipædobaptiſm unavoidable.

Ibid.

p. 811. Whereas ſome miſ-interpret the words of the old Rubrick of Confirmation in the *Engliſh* Liturgy, as if it ſpake of all that are baptized, whether they have right or not, the words themſelves may ſerve to rectifie that miſtake: [*And that no man ſhall think any detriment ſhall come to children by deferring of their confirmation, he ſhall know for truth, that it is certain by Gods word, that children being baptized have all things*

things neteſſary for their Salvation, and be undoubtedly ſaved.] where it is plain, they mean, they have all things neceſſary *ex parte Eccleſiæ*, or all Gods applying Ordinances neceſſary, though they ſhould die unconfirmed, ſuppoſing, they have all things neceſſary to juſt baptiſm on their own part: which is but what the Ancients were wont to ſay of the baptized adult; but they never meant, that the infidel and impenitent were in a ſtate of life, becauſe he was baptized, but that all that truly conſent to the Covenant, and ſignifie this by being baptized are ſaved. So the Church of *England* ſaith, that they receive no detriment by delaying confirmation; but it never ſaid, that they received no detriment by their Parents or Reſponſes infidelity or Hypocriſie, or by their want of true right, *coram Deo*, to be baptized.

Q. 39. *What is the true meaning of* Sponſors *or* Godfathers, *and is it lawful to make uſe of them?* *Anſw.* My Opinion is, that they did both witneſs the probability of the Parents fidelity, and alſo promiſed, that if they P. 214.

should either Apostatize, or dye, they
p. 815. would see, that the children were piously educated. If you take them, but as the ancient Churches did, for such as do attest the Parents fidelity, (in their perswasion) and do promise, first, to mind you of your duty, and next to take care of their pious education, if you die; I know no reason you have to scruple this much; yea more, it is in your power to agree with the Godfathers, that they shall represent your own persons, and speak and promise what they do, as your deputies, only in your names: and what have you against this? *Object. When the Churchmen mean another thing, this is but to juggle with the world. Answ.* How can you prove, that the authority, that made, or imposed the Liturgy, meant any other thing? 2. If the Imposers had meant ill, in a thing that may be done well, you may discharge your Conscience, by doing it well, and making a sufficient profession of your better sense.

Q. 42. *How is the Holy Ghost given to Infants in Baptism? whether all the chil-*

children of true Christians have inward sanctifying grace, &c. Anſ. My judgment agreeth more in this with *Davenant's*, than any others; ſaving that he doth not appropriate the benefits of Baptiſm to the children of true Believers, ſo much as I do. And though, by a Letter impleading *Davenant's* cauſe, I was the occaſion of printing good Mr. *Gataker's* Anſwer to him; yet I am ſtill moſt inclined to his judgment, Not, that all the baptized, but that all the baptized ſeed of true Chriſtians are pardoned, juſtifyed, adopted, and have a title to the ſpirit, and Salvation. And we muſt chooſe great inconveniences, if this opinion be forſaken, *viz.* that all infants muſt be taken to be out of Covenant with God, and to have no promiſe of Salvation; whereas, ſurely, the law of Grace, as well as the Covenant of works included all the ſeed in their capacity. P.

Of

Of the Reſponſes.

Q. 83. *May the people bear a vocal part in Worſhip, and do any more than ſay* Amen? *Anſw.* The people bear an equal part in ſinging the Pſalms, which are prayer, and praiſe, and inſtruction: if they may do ſo in the Pſalms in metre, there can be no reaſon given, but they may lawfully do ſo in Pſalms in Proſe; for ſaying them, and ſinging them, are but modes of utterance, and the Ancient ſinging was liker our Saying, than our tunes. The Primitive Chriſtians were ſo full of zeal, and love to Chriſt, that they would have taken it for an injury, and a quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly reſtrained from bearing their part in the praiſes of the Church. The uſe of the tongue keepeth awake the mind, and ſtirreth up God's graces, in his ſervants. It was the decay of zeal in the people, that firſt ſhut out the Reſponſes: while they kept up the ancient zeal, they were inclined to take their part vocally in the Worſhip.

p. 856.

ſhip. And this was ſeconded by the pride and uſurpation of the Prieſts thereupon; who thought the people of God too prophane to ſpeak in the Aſſemblies, and meddle ſo much with holy things. Yet the very remembrance of former zeal cauſed moſt Churches to retain many of the words of their predeceſſors, even when they loſt the life and ſpirit which ſhould animate them; and ſo the ſame words came into the Liturgies, and were uſed by too many, cuſtomarily, and in formality, which their Anceſtors had uſed in the fervour of their Souls. And † if it were not, that a dead-hearted, formal people, by ſpeaking the Reſponſes carelefly and hypocritically, do bring them into diſgrace with many, that ſee the neceſſity of ſerioufneſs, I think, few good people would be againſt them now.--- It is here the duty of every Chriſtian, to labour to reſtore the life and ſpirit to the words, that they may again be uſed in a ſerious and holy manner, as heretofore. *Exod.* 19. 8. In as ſolemn an Aſſembly as any of ours, when God gave *Moſes*

a form of words to preach to the people, all the people answered together, and said, *All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do.* So *Exod.*24.3. and *Deuter.* 5.27. which God approved of, *v.*28,29. See *Levit.* 9. 24. 2 *Kings* 23. 2, 3. P. 857. 1 *Chron.* 1. 35, 36. It is a command, *Ps.*67.3,5. *Let all the people praise thee, O God, &c.* And he that will limit this to single persons, or say that it must not be, vocally, in the Church, or, it must be in metre only, and never in prose, must prove it, lest he be proved one, that addeth to Gods word.

Q. 84. *Is it not a Sin for our Clerks, to make themselves the mouth of the* P. 857. *people?* *Answ.* The Clerks are not appointed to be the mouth of the people, but each Clerk is one of the people, commanded to do that which all should do, lest it should be wholly left undone. If all the congregation will speak all that the Clerk doth, it will answer the primary desire of the Church Governors who bid the people do it.

Of Bowing at the name Jeſus ---
And of Prieſts, Altars, &c.

Q. 86. *Is it lawful to bow at the name of* Jeſus? *Anſw.* That we may lawfully expreſs our reverence, when the names (*God, Jehovah, Jeſus, Chriſt, &c.*) are uttered, I have met with few Chriſtians who deny; nor know I any reaſon to deny it. If I live and joyn in a Church where it is commanded, and peremptorily urged, to bow at the name of *Jeſus*, and where my not doing it, would be diviſive, ſcandalous, or offenſive; I will bow at the name of *God, Jehovah, Jeſus, Chriſt, Lord, &c.* My judgment of ſtanding at the Goſpel, and kneeling at the Decalogue, (when it is commanded) is the ſame. P. 858. 859.

Q. 122. *May the name*, Prieſts, Sacrifice *and* Altars, *be lawfully uſed? Anſw.* The New Teſtament uſeth all the Greek names, which we tranſlate *Prieſts*, *Sacrifice* and *Altars*; and our tranſlation is not intolerable, if Prieſt come from Presbyter (I need not 882.

prove

prove that) if it do not, yet all Miniſters are ſubordinate to Chriſt in his Prieſtly office. And the word *Sacrifice* is uſed of us, and our offered Worſhip, 1 *Pet.* 2. 5. *Hebr.* 13. 15, 16. *Phil.* 4. 18. *Eph.* 5. 2. *Ro.* 12. 1. And *Hebr.* 13. 10. ſaith *we have an Altar*, which word is frequently uſed in the Revelations, in relation to Goſpel-times. We muſt not therefore be quarrelſome againſt the bare names, unleſs they be abuſed to ſome ill uſe. The Ancient Fathers and Churches did ever uſe all theſe words ſo familiarly, without any queſtion or ſcruple raiſed by the Orthodox, or Hereticks about them, that we ſhould be wary, how we condemn theſe words, leſt we give advantage to the Papiſts to tell their followers, that all antiquity is on their ſide. The Lords Supper is by Proteſtants truly called a *Commemorative Sacrifice.*

Of the Communion table, &c.

Qu. 123. *May the Communion Tables* P. 882. *be turned Altarwiſe? and railed in? and*

it

is it lawful to come up to the rails to communicate? Anſw. 1. God hath not given a particular command, or prohibition about theſe circumſtances, but only general rules for edification, unity, decency and order. 2. They that do it out of a deſign to draw men to Popery, or to incourage men in it, do ſin. 3. So do they, that rail in the Table, to ſignifie, that Lay-Chriſtians muſt not come to it, but be kept at a diſtance. 4. But where there are no ſuch ends, but only to imitate the Ancients, that did thus, and to ſhew reverence to the Table on the account of the Sacrament, by keeping away dogs, keeping boys from ſitting on it; and the profeſſed doctrine of the Church condemneth Tranſubſtantiation, the real corporal-preſence, *&c.* in this caſe Chriſtians ſhould take theſe, for ſuch as they are, indifferent things, and not cenſure or condemn each other for them. 5. And to communicate, is not only lawful in this caſe, where we cannot prove, that the Miniſter ſinneth, but even, when we ſuſpect an ill deſign in him, which

we

we cannot prove, yea, or when we can prove that his personal interpretation of the place, name, scituation, and rail, is unsound; for we assemble there to communicate in, and according to the professed doctrine of Christianity, and the Churches, and our own open profession, and not after every private opinion, and error of the Minister.

Of the Creed.

Qu. 139. *What is the use and authority of the Creed? is it of the Apostles framing or not?* P. 196. *Answ.* Its use is, to be a plain explication of the Faith professed in the baptismal covenant; And for the satisfaction of the Church, that men indeed understand what they did in Baptism, and professed to believe. 2. It is the Word of God, as to the matter of it, whatever it be as to the order, or composition of the words. 3. It is not to be doubted, f but the Apostles did use a Creed commonly in their days, which was the same with that, now called the Apostles,

Apoſtles, and the *Nicene*, in the main. 4. And it is eaſily probable, that Chriſt compoſed a Creed, when he made his Covenant, and inſtituted baptiſm, *Matth.* 28. 19. 5. That the Apoſtles did cauſe the baptizable, to underſtand the three Articles of Chriſts own Creed and Covenant, and uſed many explicatory words to make them underſtand it. 6. It is more than probable, that the matter opened by them, was ſtill the ſame when the words were not the ſame. 7. And it is alſo more than probable, that they did not needleſly vary the words, leſt it ſhould teach men to vary the matter. And laſtly, no doubt but this practice of the Apoſtles was imitated by the Churches, and that thus the eſſentials of Religion were by the tradition of the Creed, and Baptiſm, delivered by themſelves, as far as Chriſtianity went, long before any book of the New Teſtament was written. And the following Churches, uſing the ſame Creed, might ſo far well call it the Apoſtles Creed.

Of the Apocrypha.

Qu. 150. *Is it lawful to read the*
P. 901. *Apocrypha or Homilies?* *Answ.* It is lawful, so be it they be sound doctrine, and fitted to the peoples edification. 2. So be it they be not read scandalously, without sufficient differencing them from God's book. 3. So they be not read to exclude, or hinder the reading of the Scriptures, or other necessary Church duty. 4. So they be not read to keep up an ignorant, lazy Ministry, that can, or will do no better. 5. And especially, if Authority command it, and the Churches agreement require it.

Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience.

Qu. 153. *May we lawfully swear obedience, in all things lawful and honest, either to Usurpers, or to our lawful*
902. *Pastors?* *Answ.* If the King shall command us, it is lawful. So the old Nonconformists, who thought the *English* Prelacy an unlawful office, yet

yet maintained that it is lawful to take the Oath of Canonical obedience, because they thought it was imposed by the King, and Laws, and that we swear to them, not as Officers claiming a divine right in the spiritual Government, but as Ordinaries or Officers, made by the King, according to the Oath of Supremacy.

Of the Holiness of Churches.

Qu. 170. *Are Temples, Fonts, Utensils, Church-lands, much more Ministers holy? and what reverence is due to them, as Holy? Answ.* Temples, Utensils, Lands, *&c.* devoted, and lawfully separated by man for holy uses, are holy, as justly related to God by that lawful separation. Ministers are more holy than Temples, Lands, or Utensils, as being nearlier related to holy things; and things separated by God, are more holy than those justly separated by man. And so of Days, every thing should be reverenced according to the measure of its holiness: And this expressed by such signs, gestures, actions, as

P. 915.

as are fitteſt to honour God, to whom they are related. † And ſo to be uncovered in Church, and uſe reverent carriage and geſtures there, doth tend to preſerve due reverence to God, and to his Worſhip, 1 *Cor.* 16. 20.

† 1

Of the power of the Magiſtrate in Circumſtantials.

Five Diſſ. p. 361. Thoſe modes or circumſtances of Worſhip, which are neceſſary *in genere*, but left undetermined by God, *in ſpecie*, are left by God to humane, prudential determination. (elſe an impoſſibility ſhould be neceſſary.) It is p. 401. left to humane determination what Place the publick Aſſemblies ſhall be held in. And to determine of the time, except where God hath determined already, and what Utenſils to imploy about the publick Worſhip. Some de-
p. 409. | cent Habit is neceſſary; either the Magiſtrate, or the Miniſter, or aſſociated Paſtors muſt determine what. I think, neither Magiſtrate, nor Synod, ſhould do more than hinder indecency; if they do, and tye all to one habit (and ſuppoſe

ſuppoſe it were an indecent habit) yet this is but an imprudent uſe of power, it is a thing within the Magiſtrates reach, he doth not an aliene work, but his own work amiſs, and therefore the thing in it ſelf being lawful, I would obey him, and uſe that garment, if I could not be diſpenſed with. Yea though, ſecondarily, the whiteneſs be to ſignifie purity, and ſo it be made a teaching ſign, yet would I obey. And I ſee no reaſon to ſcruple the lawfulneſs of the Ring in marriage; for, though the Papiſts make a Sacrament of marriage, yet we have no reaſon to take it for any Ordinance of Divine Worſhip, more than the ſolemnizing a contract between a Prince and People. All things are ſanctified and pure to the pure. And, for Organs or other Inſtruments of muſick in God's worſhip, they being a help, partly natural, and partly artificial to the exhilarating the Spirits, for the praiſe of God, I know no argument to prove them ſimply unlawful, but what would prove a Cup of Wine unlawful, or the tune and metre and melody of ſinging unlawful.

p. 411.

¶ p. 412.

Chriſtian Direct. p. 884.

Of Holy-days.

Nor do I ſcruple to keep a day in remembrance of any eminent Servant of Chriſt, or Martyr, to praiſe God for their Doctrine, or Example, and honor their memorial. I am reſolved, if I live where ſuch Holy-days, (Chriſt's Nativity, Circumciſion, Faſting, Tranſfiguration, Aſcenſion, and ſuch like) are obſerved, to cenſure no man for obſerving them. But, if I lived under a government, that peremptorily commanded it, I would obſerve the outward reſt of ſuch a Holy-day, and I would preach on it, and join with the Aſſemblies in God's Worſhip, yea I would thus obſerve the day, rather than offend a weak Brother, or hinder any man's ſalvation; much more rather than I would make any diviſion in the Church.

Five Diſp. p. 412.

416.

p. 117.

See Chriſtian Directory. p. 885.

Of the Croſs in Baptiſm.

I dare not peremptorily ſay, that the Croſs in Baptiſm is unlawful; nor will

p. 418.

I

I condemn Ancients or Moderns that uſe it, nor will I make any diſturbance in the Church about it, more than my own forbearance will make. I preſume not to cenſure them that judge it lawful, but only give the reaſons that make me doubt, and rather think it to be unlawful, though ſtill with a ſuſpicion of my own underſtanding.

Of Ceremonies.

Certain things commonly called Ceremonies, may lawfully be uſed in the Church, upon Humane impoſition; and when it is not againſt the Law of God, no Perſon ſhould diſobey the commands of their lawful Governors in ſuch things. It may be very ſinful to command ſome Ceremonies, which may lawfully, yea muſt in duty be uſed, by the Subject, when they are commanded. p. 398.

Mr. *Baxter*'s judgment concerning *Confirmation* agreeable to the practice of the Church of *England*, may be ſeen in a particular Treatiſe on that Subject. *Of Confirmation*, p. 207, 220, 230.

Of Conventicles.

Christ. Direct. p. 916.

Q. 172. *Are all religious and private Meetings forbidden by Rulers, unlawful Conventicles? Answ.* 1. It is more to the Honor of the Church, and of Religion, and of God, and more to our safety and edification, to have God's worship performed solemnly, publickly, and in great Assemblies, than in a corner, secretly and with few. 2. It is a great mercy, where Rulers allow the Church such publick Worship. 3. *Cæteris paribus*, all Christians should prefer such publick Worship before private, and no private Meetings should be kept up, which are opposite, or prejudicial to such publick Meetings. And therefore, if such Meetings, (or any that are unnecessary, to the ends of the Ministry, the service of God, and good of Souls) be forbidden by lawful Rulers, they must be forborn. And it must be remembred, that Rulers that are Infidels, Papists, Hereticks, or Persecutors, that restrain Church meetings, to the injury of mens Souls, must be distinguish-

ed

ed from pious Princes, that only re-ſtrain Hereticks, and real Schiſmaticks, for the Churches good. 2. And that times of hereſie and ſchiſm may make private meetings more dangerous, than quiet times. And ſo even the *Scottiſh* Church forbad private meetings, in the Separatiſts days of late. And when they do more hurt than good, and are juſtly forbidden, no doubt, in that caſe, it is a duty to obey, and to forbear them.

It is a dangerous thing, to be inſnared in a Sect, it will, before you are aware, poſſeſs you with a ſeaverith, ſinful zeal for the Opinions, and intereſt of that Sect; it will make you bold, in bitter invectives and cenſures, againſt thoſe that differ from you; it will corrupt your Church-communion, and fill your very Prayers with partiality, and humane paſſions; it will ſecretly bring malice, under the name of Zeal, into your minds and words. In a word, it is a ſecret, but deadly enemy to Chriſtian love and peace. Let them that are wiſer, and more Orthodox, and godly than others, *ſhew* (as the Holy Ghoſt *Chriſt. Direct.* p. 49.

Ghost directeth them, *James* 3. 13, 14, &c.) *out of a good conversation their works with meekness of wisdom: But if ye have bitter envying,* (or zeal) *and strife in your hearts, Glory not, and lye not against the truth. This wisdom descendeth not from above, but is earthly, sensual, Devilish.*

Of Communion in the Lords Supper.

Christian Directory. p. 616.

Qu. 2. *May we communicate with unworthy persons? Answ.* It is your duty to communicate with that Church which hath a true Pastor, and where the denominating part of the members are capable of Church-communion, though there may some Infidels, or Heathen, or uncapable Persons violently intrude, or scandalous Persons are admitted, through the neglect of Discipline, in case you have not your choice to hold personal communion with a better Church, and in case also you be not guilty of the corruption, but by seasonable and modest professing your dissent, do clear your self of the guilt of such intrusion and corruption. Qu. 3.

Qu. 3. *But what if I cannot communicate, unleſs I conform to an impoſed geſture, as kneeling?* *Anſw.* I never yet heard any thing to prove kneeling unlawful; there is no Word of God, for, or againſt, any geſture. Chriſt's example cannot be proved to oblige us in this, and his geſture was not ſuch a ſitting as ours. The nature of the Ordinance is mixt. And if it be lawful to take a Pardon from the King upon our Knees, I know not what can make it unlawful to take a Sealed Pardon from Chriſt, by his Ambaſſador, upon our Knees. As for this Ceremony of kneeling at the Sacrament eſpecially, ſince the Rubrick is inſerted, which diſclaimeth, both all Bread-worſhip, and the bodily real-preſence, my judgment was ever for it. God having made ſome geſture neceſſary, and confined us to none, but left it to humane determination, I ſhall ſubmit to Magiſtrates, in their proper work. I am not ſure, that Chriſt intended the example of himſelf in this as obligatory; but I am ſure, he hath commanded me obedience, and peace. Mr. *Perkins* was for

Five Diſſ. p. 411.

Defenſe, p. 177.

for kneeling, and Mr. *Baines* in his Letters writes for it, and answers objections against it.

Christ. Direct. p. 607.

Qu. 4. *But what if I cannot communicate, but according to the administration of the Common-prayer book?* *Answ.* 1. That it is not unlawful to receive according to the administration of the Common-prayer book, because it is a form, needs no proof to any, that is judicious. 2. Nor yet, for any evil in this particular form, for in this part the Common-prayer is generally approved. 3. Nor yet, because it is imposed; for a command maketh not that unlawful to us, which is lawful before, but it maketh many things lawful, and duties, that else would have been unlawful accidentally. 4. And the intentions of the Commanders we have little to do with. And for the consequents, they must be weighed on both sides, and the consequents of our refusal will not be found light. In general, I must here tell the People of God, in the bitter sorrow of my Soul, that at last it is time for them to discern that temptation, that hath in all ages of the Church

Church almoſt, made this Sacrament of our union, to be the grand occaſion or inſtrument of our diviſions. And that, true humility, and acquaintance with our ſelves, and love to Chriſt, and one another, would ſhew ſome men that it was but their pride and prejudice, and ignorance, that made them think ſo heinouſly of other mens manner of worſhip. And that, on all ſides, among true Chriſtians, the manner of their worſhip is not ſo odious, as prejudice, and faction, and partiality repreſenteth it. And that God accepteth that, which they reject. And they ſhould ſee, how the Devil hath undone the common People, by this means, by teaching them every one to expect ſalvation for being of that Party which he taketh to be the right Church, and for worſhipping in that manner which he, and his Party, thinketh beſt. And ſo wonderful a thing is prejudice, that every Party, by this, is brought to think that ridiculous and vile, which the other party accounteth beſt. But to magnifie any one Church or Party, ſo as to deny due love and com-

Chriſtian Dirct. p. 48.

communion to the reſt, is Schiſm. To limit all the Church to your party, and deny all, or any of the reſt, to be Chriſtians, and parts of the Univerſal Church, is Schiſm, by a dangerous breach of Charity. It is Schiſm alſo, to condemn unjuſtly any particular Church, as no Church. And it is Schiſm, to withdraw your bodily communion from a Church that you were bound to hold communion with, upon a falſe ſuppoſition that it is no Church, or is not lawfully to be communicated with. And it is Schiſm, to make Diviſions or Parties in a Church, though you divide not from that Church. The holineſs of the Party that men adhere to, is made a pretence to excuſe Schiſm; but this muſt make but a gradual difference in our eſteem and love to ſome Chriſtians above others. If really they are moſt holy, I muſt love them moſt, and labour to be as holy as they: But I muſt not therefore, unjuſtly deny communion, or due reſpect to other Chriſtians, that are leſs holy, nor cleave to them as a Sect, or divided Party, whom I eſteem moſt

† P. 49.

moſt holy. For the holieſt are moſt Charitable, and moſt againſt the diviſions among Chriſtians, and tendereſt of their unity and peace. Own the beſt, as beſt, but none, as a divided Sect; eſpouſe not their dividing intereſt; confine not your eſpecial love to a party, but extend it to all the members of Chriſt. Deny not local communion when there is occaſion for it, to any Church, that hath the Subſtance of true worſhip, and forceth you not to ſin. Love them as true Chriſtians, and Churches, even when they drive you from their Communion. I have found that Reformation is to be accompliſhed more by reſtoration of Ordinances and adminiſtrations to their primitive nature and uſe, than by utter abolition. Baxter of Confirmation, pag.

Of the Liturgy.

My Opinion as to Liturgy in general, is, 1. That a ſtinted Liturgy is in it ſelf lawful. 2. That a ſtinted Liturgy in ſome parts of Publick Service is neceſſary. 3. In the parts where Diſpute the 4th of Church Government. p. 358.

where it is not neceſſary, it may not only be ſubmitted to, but deſired, when the peace of the Church re-
p. 359. quireth it. 4. It is not of ſuch neceſſity to take the matter, and words out of the Holy Scriptures, but that
See Chriſtian Direct. p. 847. we may joyn in a Liturgy, or uſe it, if the form of words be not from Scripture. This is thus proved: 1. That which is not directly, or conſequentially forbidden by God, remaineth lawful. A ſtinted Liturgy is not directly, or conſequentially forbidden of God: Therefore it remaineth lawful. The major is undoubted, becauſe nothing but a prohibition can make a thing unlawful; where there is no Law, there is no tranſgreſſion. Yet I have heard very reverend men anſwer this, That it is enough that it is not commanded, though not forbidden, which is plainly to deny both Scripture and Civil principles. Now for the Minor, That a ſtinted Liturgy is not forbidden, we need no other proof,
p. 361. than that no prohibition can be produced.

If

If it be lawful for the *people* to uſe a ſtinted form of words, in Publick prayer, then is it in it ſelf lawful for the *Paſtors*: But it is lawful for the people, *&c.* for the Paſtors prayer (which they muſt pray over with him, and not only hear it) is a ſtinted form to them, even as much as if he had learnt it out of a book. P. 364.

It is lawful to uſe a form in preaching, therefore a ſtinted Liturgy is lawful. 1. Becauſe preaching is a part of that Liturgy. 2. Becauſe the reaſon is the ſame for prayer as for that in the main.

That which hath been the practice of the Church in Scripture-times and down to this day, and is yet the practice of almoſt all the Churches of Chriſt on earth, is not like to be unlawful: But ſuch is the uſe of ſome ſtinted forms, *&c.*

I have ſhewed, that it was ſo in the *Jewiſh* Church. That it hath been of ancient uſe in the Church, ſince Chriſt, and at this day in *Africk*, *Aſia*, *Europe*, and the Reformed Churches in *France*, *Holland*, *Geneva*, *&c.* is ſo well

well known that I need not ſtand to prove it: and thoſe few that ſeem to diſuſe it, do yet uſe it in Pſalms and other parts of worſhip. As for the Common-prayer it ſelf, I never rejected it, becauſe it was a form; or thought it ſimply unlawful, becauſe it was ſuch a form; but have made uſe of it, and would do again in the like caſe.

† Object. *But if a faulty manner of praying be preſcribed, and impoſed by a law, I know it before-hand and am guilty of it.* *Anſw.* If the thing be ſinful, either it is, 1. becauſe the prayers are defective and faulty; or, 2. becauſe they are impoſed, or, 3. becauſe you knew the fault before-hand: but none of theſe can prove your joyning with them ſinful. 1. Not becauſe they are faulty; for you may joyn with as faulty prayers (you confeſs) if not impoſed. 2. Not becauſe impoſed, for that is an extenuation, and not an aggravation. For (1.) it proveth the Miniſter leſs voluntary of the two, than thoſe are that do it without any command, through the error of their own

Chriſtian Directory, p. 748.

See Chriſtian Direct. p. 848.

own judgments. (2.) Becauſe (though lawful things oft become unlawful when Superiors forbid them, yet) no reaſon can be given, why a lawful thing ſhould become unlawful, becauſe a lawful Superior doth command it; elſe Superiors might take away all our Chriſtian liberty, and make all things unlawful to us, by commanding them. You would take it for a wild conceit in your children or ſervants, if they ſay, when you bid them learn a Catechiſm, or uſe a form of prayer, It was lawful for us to do it till you commanded us, but becauſe you bid us do it, it is unlawful. If it be a duty to obey Governors in all lawful things, then it is not a ſin to obey them. 3. It is not your knowing before-hand, that makes it unlawful: for 1. I know in general before-hand, that all imperfect men will do imperfectly: and though I know not the particular, that maketh it never the lawfuller, if foreknowledge it ſelf did make it unlawful. 2. If you know that (*e.g.*) an Antinomian, or ſome miſtaken Preacher,

would conſtantly drop ſome words for his error, in praying or preaching, that will not make it unlawful in your own judgment, for you to joyn (if it be not a flat hereſie.) 3. It is another mans error or fault that you foreknow, and not your own. 4. God himſelf doth as an univerſal cauſe of nature concur with men in thoſe acts which he foreknoweth they will ſinfully do, yet is not the Author or approver of the ſin.

Defence, p. 38. We (the Commiſſioners 1663.) all thought a Liturgy lawful, and divers learned and reverend Nonconformiſts of *London* met to conſider how far it was their duty or lawful to communicate with the Pariſh Churches, where they lived, in the Liturgy and Sacrament, and I proved four propoſitions: 1. That it is lawful to uſe a form; 2. That it is lawful to joyn with ſome Pariſh Churches in the uſe of the Liturgy; 3. That it is lawful to joyn with ſome Pariſh Churches in the Lords Supper; 4. That it is to ſome a duty to joyn with ſome Pariſh Churches three times a year in the Lords

Lords Supper: and none of the Brethren ſeemed to diſſent, but took the reaſons to be valid.

Were I in *Armenia*, *Abaſſia*, or among the *Greeks*, I would joyn in a much more defective form than our Liturgy, rather than none. And this is the judgment of many *New-England* Miniſters, conform to the old Non-conformiſts, who did ſome of them read the Common-Prayer, and the moſt of them judged it lawful to joyn in it, or elſe Mr. *Hilderſham*, Mr. *Rich*, *Rogers*, *&c.* would not write ſo earneſtly for coming to the beginning, and preferring it before all private duties. And truly I am not able to bear the thoughts of ſeparating from almoſt all Chriſts Churches upon earth; but he that ſeparates from one, or many, upon a reaſon common to almoſt all, doth virtually ſeparate from almoſt all; and he that ſeparates from all among us upon the account of the unlawfulneſs of our Liturgy, and the badneſs of our Miniſtry, doth ſeparate from them upon a reaſon common to almoſt

p. 176. †

p. 54. ¶

all, or the far greateſt part, as I conceive.

Cure of Diviſions, p 200. Thoſe forms of Liturgy which now are moſt diſtaſted, were brought in by the moſt zealous religious people at the firſt: the many ſhort invocations, verſicles and reſponſes, which the people uſe, were brought in when the Souls of the faithful did abound with zeal and in holy fervors break out in ſuch expreſſions, and could not well endure to be bare Auditors & not vocally to bear their part in the praiſes of God and prayers of the Church.

p. 174. I have ſhewed at large, How far God hath given men power to preſcribe, and impoſe forms for others, and commanded others to obey them: when Chriſt ſaid, *When ye pray, ſay,* p. 179. *Our Father, &c.* he bound the Diſciples in duty to do as he bid them; p. 185. How forms may be impoſed publickly on the congregations of Believers, and on the Miniſters, yea though the forms impoſed be worſe than the exerciſe of their own gifts, (though among us no man be forbidden to uſe his own gifts in the Pulpit.) The Phariſees long

long Liturgy (it is like) was in many things worſe than ours; yet Chriſt and his Apoſtles often joyned with them, and never condemned them. I ſhall now only add that the Lord's prayer is a form directed to God as in the third perſon, and not to man only as a directory for prayer in the Second Perſon: it is not, *Pray to God your Father in heaven that his name may be Hallowed, his Kingdom come, &c.* But, *Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, &c.* And it ſeems by the diſciples words that thus *John* taught his diſciples to pray, *Luke* 11.1. and we have in the Scripture the mention of many Set forms of Service to God, which therefore we may well uſe. And I deſire the Reader again to Note, that though Prayer was corrupted by the Phariſees, yet Chriſt uſually joyned in their Synagogues, *Luke* 14. 17. and never medled with our controverſie about the lawfulneſs of Set forms. [This Mr. *Baxter* infers from *Calvins* note on *Matth.* 6. before the Preface to the Defence.]

Five Diſput p. 363.

Of Obedience to our Paſtors.

Sacrileg. Deſerting, p. 103. We are indangered by diviſions, principally becauſe the ſelf-conceited part of Religious people will not be ruled by their Paſtors, but muſt have their way, and will needs be rulers of the Church and them. But pleaſing † the ignorant Profeſſors humors, is a ſin that ſhews us to be too humane and carnal, and hath always ſad effects at laſt. It is a high degree of pride for persons of (*ordinary*) underſtandings, to conclude, that almoſt all Chriſts Churches in the world for thirteen hundred years at leaſt, have offered ſuch worſhip to God, as that you are obliged to avoid it, and all their communion in it; and that almoſt all the Catholick Church on earth at this day is below your communion, for uſing forms. Mark, Is it † not more of the women and apprentices that are of this mind, than of old experienced Chriſtians?

p. 101, 192.

Baxter *againſt* Crandon, p. 83. I think till we have better taught, † even our godly people, what credit and

and obedience is due to their teachers, and ſpiritual guides, the Church of *England* ſhall never have peace, or any good or eſtabliſhed order. We are broken for want of the knowledge of this truth; till this be known we ſhall never be well bound up and healed. The people of the new ſeparation, ſo much rule their Miniſters, that many of them have been forced to forſake their own judgments to comply with the violent. *Cure of Diviſ.* p. 393.

Labour to maintain the Ordinances and Miniſtry in eſteem. *Saints Reſt.* p. 519.

The Church is bound to take many a man, as a true Miniſter to them, and receive the Ordinances from him, in faith and expectation of bleſſing, upon promiſe, who yet before God is a ſinful invader and uſurper of the Miniſtry, and ſhall be condemned for it. (How much more then to reſpect their lawful Biſhops and Paſtors?) *Church Government*, p. 131.

For Lay-Elders, As far as I underſtand, the greateſt part, if not three for one of the *Engliſh* Miniſters, are of this mind, That unordained Elders wanting power to preach or adminiſter *5. Diſput. Preface*, p. 4.

ſter Sacraments, are not Officers in the Church of God's appointment: of this number I am one, and Mr. *Vines* was another.

Of Biſhops.

Five Diſſ. p. 20. As for Biſhops (*viz.*) a Dioceſan, ruling all the Presbyters, but leaving the Presbyters to rule the People, and conſequently taking to himſelf the ſole, or chief power of Ordination, but leaving cenſures and abſolution to them, except in caſe of Appeal to himſelf; I muſt needs ſay that this ſort of Epiſcopacy is very ancient, and hath been for many Ages of very common reception through a great part of the Church------And if I lived in a place, where this government were eſtabliſhed, and managed for God, I would ſubmit thereto, and live peaceably under it, and do nothing to the diſturbance, diſgrace or diſcouragement of it. (You may ſee how far Mr. *Vines* and Mr. *Baxter* did agree in the notion of a Biſhop over many Presbyters.) Of which *Grotius* in his Commentary on the

p. 352.

the *Acts*, and particularly, *chap.* 17. ſaith, that as in every particular Synagogue, many of which were in ſome one City (in *Jeruſalem* 480.) there was Ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ſuch was the Primitive Biſhop. And doubtleſs the firſt Biſhops were over the community of Presbyters, as Presbyters, in joynt relation to one Church or region; which region being upon the increaſe of believers divided into more Churches, and in after-times, thoſe Churches aſſigned to particular men; yet he the Biſhop, continued Biſhop over them ſtill. For that * you ſay, he had a negative voice, that is more than ever I ſaw proved, or I think ever ſhall, for the firſt 200. Years; and yet I have laboured to enquire into it. That makes him *Angelus Princeps*, not *Angelus Præſes*, as Dr. *Reinolds* ſaith. *Calvin* denies that, and makes him *Conſul in Senatu*, or as the Speaker in the Houſe of Parliament, which, as I have heard that *D. B.* did ſay, was but to make him foreman of the Jury. As touching the introduction of ruling Elders, ſuch as are modelled out by Parli-

Sigonius de Repub. Heb. l. 2. c. 8.

* Mr. Baxter.

Parliament, my judgment is sufficiently known. I am of your judgment in the point, There should be such Elders, as have power to preach as well as rule. On this Mr. *Baxter* reflects, *p.* 353. Though Mr. *Vines* here yield not the negative voice to have been *de facto*, in the first or second age, nor to be *de Jure*; yet he without any question yielded to the stating of a President, *durante vitâ*, if he prove not unworthy, which was one point that I propounded to him; and I make no doubt, but he would have yielded to a voluntary consent of Presbyters, *de facto*, not to ordain without the President. And the difficulties that are before us, *de facto*, in setting up a Parochial Episcopacy, which he mentioneth, I have cleared already in these Papers, shewing partly, that the thing is already existent, and partly how more fully to accomplish it.

The Instances which he gives, are in the Episcopacy of the Protestant Churches in *Poland*, from *Adrian Regenvolscius*, *Hist. Eccles. Sclavon. l.* 3. *p.* 424. *N. B.* Whereas from the first reforma-

formation of the Churches in the Province of the leſſer *Polonia*, it hath been received by uſe and cuſtome, that out of the Elders of all thoſe (*Diſtrictus*) Diviſions, which are 36. in Number, one Primate, or Chief, in Order, who is commonly called Superintendent of the Churches of leſſer *Poland*, and doth preſide over the Provincial Synods, be choſen by the Authority, conſent, and ſuffrage of the Provincial Synod, and that he be inaugurated, and declared, (not by impoſition of hands, to avoid the ſuſpicion of Primacy, and the appearance of authority and power over the other Elders) only by benediction, and fraternal Prayers, and by reading over the offices, which concern this function, and the prayers of the whole Synod, for the ſake of government and good order in the Church of God, *&c.*

The other inſtance is of the Churches of the *Bohemian* Confeſſion, who have among the Paſtors of the Churches, their Conſeniors and Seniors, and one Preſident over all, related by the ſame *Regenvolſcius*, *p.* 315. The Elders

ders or the Superintendents of the *Bohemian* and *Moravian* Churches, &c. are for the moſt part, choſen out of their Fellow-Elders, *and are ordained* and *conſecrated to the office of Seigniory by impoſition of hands*, and *publick inauguration*, &c.

Defence, p. 65. Thoſe that treated with the Biſhops, 1660. did yield to ſuch an Epiſcopacy, as the old Non-conformiſts would ſcarce generally have conſented to, *i.e.* to Biſhop *Uſher*'s model.

☿ Epiſcopacy is not ſuch an upſtart thing, nor defended by ſuch contemptible reaſons, as that the controverſie is like to dye with this age; undoubtedly there will be a godly and learned Party for it, while the World endureth. And it is a numerous party: all the *Greek* Church, the *Armenian*, *Syrian*, *Abaſſine*, and all others, but a few of the Reformed. For *Denmark*, *Sweden*, part of *Germany*, and *Tranſylvania* have a Superintendency, as high as that I plead for. *p.* 11. If you know no godly perſons of the Epiſcopal way, I do, and as my acquaintance increaſeth, I know more and more, and ſome I take

to

to be much better than my ſelf, I will ſay a greater word, that I know thoſe of them, whom I think as godly, humble Miniſters, as moſt of the Non-conformiſts, whom I know. *p.* 12. And I believe, there are many hundred godly Miniſters in the Church of *England*, and that their Churches are true Churches. And I am confident, moſt of the Miniſters in *England* would be content to yield to ſuch an Epiſcopacy, as you may find in the publiſhed judgments of Biſh. *Hall*, *Uſher*, Dr. *Forbes*, *Hodſworth*, and others. *Preface to the Five Diſputations*, p. 9.

Of Sacriledge.

Qu. 171. *What is Sacriledge?* *Anſ.* It is a robbing God by the unjuſt alienation of Holy things. As depoſing Kings, ſilencing true Miniſters, the unjuſt alienating of Temples, Utenſils, Lands, Days ſeparated by God himſelf and juſtly conſecrated by Man. *Chriſt. Direct* p. 916.

Mr.

Mr. Vines *his Letter to Mr.* Baxter, *p.* 35. *of the* 5. Diſput. *concerning Sacriledge.*

As for your Queſtion about Sacriledge, I am very near you in the preſent Opinion. The point was never ſtated nor debated in the *Iſle of Wight*; I did for my part decline the diſpute, for I could not maintain the cauſe as on the Parliament ſide; And becauſe, both I and others were unwilling, it was never brought to open debate. The Commiſſioners did argue it with the King, but they went upon grounds of Law and Polity, and it was only about Biſhops Lands; for they then averred the continuance of Dean and Chapter Lands to the uſe of the Church. Some deny that there is any ſin of Sacriledge under the Goſpel, and if there be any, they agree not in the definition. Some hold an Alienation of Church-goods, in caſe of Neceſſity, and then make the neceſſity, what, and as extenſive, as they pleaſe. The moſt are of Opinion, that while the

the Church lyes ſo unprovided for, the donations are not alienable, *ſine Sacrilegio*. If there were a Surpluſage above the competent maintenance, it were another matter. It is clear enough, the Donors wills are fruſtrated, and that their general intention, and the general uſe (*viz.* the maintenance of God's Worſhip, and Miniſters) ſhould ſtand, though the particular uſe might be ſuperſtitious. I cited in my laſt Sermon before the Parliament a place out of Mr. *Hilderſham*, on *Pſal.* 51. touching Sacriledge. It did not pleaſe. If his deſcription of it be true, then you will ſtill be of your own mind. I dare encourage no Purchaſers, *&c.*

Mr. Baxter's *advice to ſeparating Brethren.*

As to *ſeparation*: Be the backwardeſt to divide and ſeparate, and do it not without a certain warrant, and extreme neceſſity; reſolve with *Auguſtine*, I will not be the Chaff, and yet I will not go out of the Floor, though the Chaff be there. Never give over your *Cure of Diviſ.* p. 80.

juſt deſire and endeavour for Reformation, and yet as long as you can poſſibly avoid it. Forſake not the Church that you deſire to reform; as *Paul* ſaid to them, that were to forſake a ſhipwrackt Veſſel, *If theſe abide not in the Ship, ye cannot be ſaved.* Many a one, by unlawful flying and ſhifting for his own greater peace and ſafety, doth much more hazard his own and others.

Of Raiſing Churches againſt Churches.

Defence, p. 36. The intereſt of the Chriſtian Proteſtant Religion in *England*, muſt be much kept up by keeping up as much of truth, piety and reputation as is poſſible in the Pariſh-Churches. Therefore,----In Pariſhes where all may hear the Pariſh-Miniſter, I would not have you, without neceſſity, to preach at the ſame hour of the day, but at ſome middle time, that you may not ſeem to vie with him for Auditors, nor to draw the People from him; but let them go with you to hear him, and after come and hear you.

Sacrilegious deſerting, p. 92.

Do

Do not meet together in oppoſition to the publick meeting, nor at the time of publick worſhip, nor yet to make a groundleſs ſchiſm, or to ſeparate from the Church, whereof you are Members, nor to deſtroy the old, that you may gather a new Church out of its ruines, as long as it hath the Eſſentials, and there is hope of reforming it; nor yet would I have you forward to vent your own ſuppoſed gifts and parts in teaching, where there is no neceſſity of it; nor as a ſeparated Church, but as a part of the Church more diligent than the reſt in redeeming time. Let all your private meetings be in ſubordination to the publick, and by the approbation and conſent of your ſpiritual guides, *remembring them which have the rule over you*, Heb. 13. 7, 8, 9. *And I beſeech you Brethren, mark them which cauſe diviſions and offences, contrary to the Doctrine which you have learned and avoid them, &c.* Rom. 16. 17, 18. I would you would ponder every one of theſe words, for they are the precious advice of the Spirit of God, and neceſſary now as well as then. *Saints Reſt, P. 518.*

Preface to Confess. The great advantages that *Satan* hath got upon the Church through the sin of the Pastors, in these later dayes, is by division. By this he hath promoted all the rest of his designs. Our division gratifieth the Papist, and greatly hazardeth the Protestant Religion, more than most of you seem to believe or regard. It advantageth profaneness, and greatly hindereth the success of the Ministers; it pleaseth *Satan* and builds up his kingdom.

Defence, p. 17.

Epistle to separate congregations. The hand of God is apparently gone out against the Separatists; you see you do but prepare persons for a further progress; Seekers, Ranters, Quakers and too many professed Infidels, do spring up from among you, as if this were the journeys end and perfection of your revolt. By such fearful desertions did God formerly witness his detestation of those that withdrew from the unity of the Church. And separation will ruine the separated Churches themselves; it will admit of no consistency. Parties will arise in the separated Churches, and separate again from them till they are dis-

Defence, p. 50.

diſſolved. I beſeech my Brethren to open their eyes ſo far, as to regard experience. How few ſeparated Churches do now exiſt, that were in being an hundred years ago, can you name any? and would you have all the Churches of Chriſt to be diſſolved?

In the year 1634. *Roger Williams* of *New-England*, an Aſſiſtant to Mr. *Ralph Smith* Paſtor at *Plymouth*, where, having vented divers ſingular opinions, he was diſmiſſed, went to *Salem*, which place in a years time he filled with principles of rigid Separation, tending to Anabaptiſtry, as, That it is not lawful for an unregenerate man to pray, or take an Oath, in ſpecial not the Oath of fidelity to the Magiſtrate. He forbad any of his Church-members to hear the godly Miniſters of *England* when occaſionally they went thither. He taught that the Magiſtrate had nothing to do in matters of the firſt Table; that there ſhould be an unlimited toleration of all Religions; that to puniſh any man for his Conſcience was Perſecution. He *Anſw. to Exceptions* p. 170.

ſeparated not only from the Churches of *Old*, but of *New-England* alſo, as Antichriſtian. After that, he would not pray, or give thanks with his own wife or family, becauſe they went to the Church-aſſemblies. He kept private meetings by way of ſeparation from, and oppoſition to the Church-aſſembly; and being baniſhed as a diſturber of the peace, he ſate down at a place called *Providence*, and there fell to Anabaptiſtry, renouncing Infant baptiſm. And after a while he told his people, that he was out of the way himſelf, and had miſled them, for he could not find that any on earth had power to adminiſter baptiſm, and therefore their laſt baptiſm was a nullity as well as the firſt, and that they muſt wait for the coming of new Apoſtles; and ſo they diſſolved and turned Seekers.

The caſe of the *Summer Iſlands* as related by Mr. *Vaughan*, a worthy Miniſter come from thence upon diſcouragement, would make a Chriſtian heart to bleed. To hear how ſtrict and regular, and hopeful that Plantation

tion once was, and how one godly Miniſter by Separation, ſelecting a few to be his Church, rejecting all the reſt from the Sacrament, the rejected party were doleſully eſtranged from Religion, and the ſelected party turned Quakers. But our own caſe is yet a more lamentable proof, what Separation hath done againſt Religion; ſo that it is my wonder that any good man can over-look it.

Above all things I intreat the dividing Brethren, if they can ſo long lay aſide partiality, to judge of the reaſons of their ſeparation. The defects of the Liturgy, and the faults of thoſe by whom we ſuffer, are eaſily heightned even beyond deſert. But when many of us vent untruths, and ſlanders againſt our Brethren, and multiply publick untruths, we never make ſcruple of communion with ſuch. Suppoſe one ſhould ſay, that a people guilty of ſuch ſins, as are condemned, *Exod.*23.1,2. *Pſ.* 15.3. *Rom.* 1.30, *&c.* (*i. e.* raiſing falſe reports, reproaching our neighbours, ſtrife and debates) ſhould not be communi-

Defence, p. 68.

nicated with, especially when not one of these offenders is called to repentance for it, what answer will you give to this which will not confute your own objections against communion with many parish Churches in this land?

Defence, p. 21. As to Popery; The interest of the Protestant Religion must be much kept up, by the means of the Parish Ministers, and by the doctrine and worship there performed; and they that think and endeavour contrary to this, (of which side soever) shall have the hearty thanks and concurrence of the Papists. p. 52. Nor am I causelessly afraid, that if we suffer the principles and practices, which I write against, to proceed without our contradiction, Popery will get by it so great advantage as may hazard us all, and we may lose that which the several parties do contend about.

Three ways especially Popery will grow out of our divisions, 1. By the odium and scorn of our disagreements, inconsistency, and multiplied Sects, they will perswade people, that we must

muſt either come for unity to them, or elſe all run mad, and crumble into duſt and individuals. Thouſands have been drawn to Popery, or confirmed in it, by this argument already: And I am perſwaded, that all the Arguments elſe in *Bellarmine*, and all other books that ever were written, have not done ſo much to make Papiſts in *England*, as the multitude of Sects among our ſelves. Some Profeſſors of Religious ſtrictneſs and great eſteem for Godlineſs, having run from Sect to Sect, and finding no conſiſtency turned Papiſts themſelves.

2. Who knows not how fair a game the Papiſts have to play by our diviſions? Methinks I hear them hiſſing on both parties, ſaying to one ſide, Lay more upon them, and abate them nothing: And to the other, Stand it out, and yield to nothing: hoping that our diviſions will carry us to ſuch practices, as ſhall make us accounted ſeditious, rebellious, and dangerous to publick peace, and ſo they may paſs for better ſubjects than we, or elſe, that they may get a toleration

toge-

together with us. And ſhall they uſe our hands to do their work? We have already ſerved them unſpeakably, both in this, and in abating the odium of the Gunpowder plot, and other Treaſons.

3. It is not the leaſt of our danger, leſt by our follies, extremities and rigors we ſo exaſperate the common people, as to make them readier to joyn with the Papiſts, than with us, in caſe of competitions, invaſions or inſurrections againſt the King and kingdoms peace.

K. for Catbol. † The Papiſts account, that if the Puritans get the day, they ſhall make great advantage of it; for they will be unſetled, and all in pieces, and not know how to ſettle the government. Factions and diſtractions (ſay they) give us footing for continual attempts. To make all ſure, we will ſecretly have our party among Puritans alſo, that we may be ſure to maintain our intereſt.

Baxter's Holy Common-wealth Let the Magiſtrate cheriſh the diſputations of the Teachers, and let him procure them often to debate together,

gether, and reprove one another; for ſo, when all men ſee, that there is nothing certain among them, they will eaſily yield, (ſaith *Contzen* the Jeſuit.)

Of Spiritual Pride.

Proud men will not grow in the ſame field, or Church, where tares do grow, but will tranſplant themſelves, becauſe God will not pluck up the tares, eſpecially if any miniſterial neglect of diſcipline be conjoyned; and inſtead of blaming their own pride, lay the blame on the corruptions of the Church.---- The Phariſees Liturgy is frequent in ſeparate Aſſemblies, *God I thank thee, I am not as other men.* But this is very remarkable, that it is a pretence of our impurity, and a greater purity with you that is pleaded by ſuch as firſt turn over to you; and that this height of all impieties ſhould be the uſual iſſue of a way, pretended ſo exact and clean, doubtleſs it is not Gods mind, by this to diſcourage any from purity and true

Epiſtle to Separate Congreg.

true reformation, but to ſhew his deteſtation of that ſpiritual pride, which maketh men to have too high thoughts of themſelves, and too much to contemn others, and to deſire to be further ſeparated from them, than God in the day of grace doth allow of. Conſider this, it is the judgment of ſome, that thouſands are gone to hell, and ten thouſands on their march thither, that in all probability had never come there, if they had not been tempted from the Pariſh Churches, for injoyment of communion in a purer Church.

Chriſtian Direct. p. 733. He that cauſeth differences of judgment and practice, & contendings in the Church, doth cauſe diviſions, though none ſeparate from the Church. If you may not divide in the Church, nor from it, then you may not cauſeleſly divide from it your ſelves.

Cure of Diviſions, P. 359. And commonly appearance, advantage, intereſt, and a taking tone and voice do more with the moſt, than ſolid evidence of truth. But they who deſire to have a party follow them, and are buſie in perſwading others to be

be of their mind, and ſpeak perverſe things, &c. are guilty of Church diviſions.

Do not you condemn a carnal ſtate? Remember they are carnal, who are contentious dividers in the Churches, 1 *Cor.* 3. 1. You will diſallow a fleſhly mind and life; Remember then, that *the works of the fleſh are theſe*, As *adultery, fornication*, &c. ſo *hatred*, or enmity, *variance, emulations, wrath, ſtrife, ſeditions, διχοστασίαι, dividings into parties.*--- When once parties are ingaged by their opinions in Anti-Churches, and fierce diſputings, the fleſh and Satan will be working in them againſt all that is holy, ſweet, and ſafe. *Defence*, p. 3. *Cure of Diviſ.* p. 77.

Of Superſtition.

Do you not hate Superſtition? Conſider then, what ſuperſtition is; it is the making of any new parts of Religion to our ſelves, and fathering them upon God. Of this there are two ſorts, poſitive, and negative. When we falſely ſay, This is a duty com- p. 282. ℙ

commanded by God, or when we falsely say, This is a sin forbidden by God, take heed of both. For instance, The Scripture telleth us of no Church-
p. 288. Elders, but what were ordained, and of none but such as were of the same office with the preaching Pastors or Elders, of none that had not authority to baptize and administer the Lords Supper; nor doth Church-History tell us of any other, as a divine office. But now we have concluded, that there is a distinct office of Ruling Elders, who need not be ordained, and who have no power to baptize, or to administer the Lords Supper. This I think is Superstition, for we feign God to have made a Church-office which he never made.---That it is simply unlawful to
290. use a form of prayer, or to read a prayer on a book; That if a School-master impose a form upon a Scholar, or a Parent on a child, it maketh it become unlawful; That our presence maketh us guilty of all the errors, or unmeet expressions of the Minister, in publick worship, at least if we be-

fore

fore know of them, and therefore that we muſt joyn with none, whoſe errors or miſ-expreſſion we know of before;---- That we are guilty of the ſins of all unworthy or ſcandalous Communicants, if we communicate with them, though their admiſſion is not by our fault; That he whoſe judgment is againſt a Dioceſan-Church may not lawfully joyn with a Pariſh-Church, if the Miniſter be but ſubject to the Dioceſan; That whatſoever is unlawfully commanded, is not lawful to be obeyed; That it is unlawful to do any thing in the Worſhip of God, which is impoſed by men, and is not commanded in the Scripture: Theſe and more ſuch as theſe are Superſtitions, which ſome Religious people have brought in. And by all ſuch inventions fathered upon God, and made a part of Religion, the minds of men are corrupted, and diſquieted, and the Churches diſturbed and divided. p. 192.

Of

Of Cenſoriouſneſs.

Preface to Cure of Diviſions.

Is not cenſoriouſneſs and raſh judging a ſin? Yet one congregation of the diviſion labours to make others odious and contemptible, and that is called the preaching of truth and purer worſhipping of God. I have ſeen this grow up to the height of Ranters, in horrid blaſphemies; and then of Quakers, in diſdainful pride and ſurlineſs, and into Seekers, that were to ſeek for a Miniſtry, a Church, a Scripture, and conſequently a Chriſt. † I have lived to ſee it put to the Queſtion (in the little Parliament) whether all the Miniſters of the Pariſhes of *England* ſhould be put down at once. I have ſeen how confidently the killing of the King, the rebellious demoliſhing of the Government of the Land, the killing of many thouſands of their Brethren, the turnings and overturnings of all kind of rule, even that which themſelves ſet up, have been committed, and juſtified, and profanely fathered upon God; theſe with much

much more such fruits of love-killing principles I have seen.

If you converse with censorious Separatists, you shall hear so many invectives against them that are truly Catholick and sober, as will make you think, that love and peace and Catholick communion are some sinful and mischievous things. *Cure.* p. 152.

The experience of 26. Years in this Kingdom may convince the World, what crimes may stand with high professions; such as the generation springing up will scarce believe. What high Professors were the proudest overturners of all Government, and resisters and despisers of Ministry and holy order in the Churches? The most railing Quakers, and most filthy blaspheming Ranters, to warn the World to take heed of being proud of superficial gifts, and high profession, and that he that stands in his own conceit should take heed lest he fall. p. 24. ☞

I have much ado to forbear naming some high Professors known lately at *Worcester*, *Exeter*, and other places, who dyed Apostate-Infidels, deriding Chri- p. 268. ☞

ſtianity, and the Immortality of the Soul, who once were Separatiſts. And
p. 188. I have heard of ſome Separatiſts, who when others of a contrary judgment were going to the Churches at *London*, looked in at the Doors, ſaying, The Devil choak thee, art thou not out of thy pottage yet?

p. 22. I commend to all that of the Apoſtle, *Phil.* 2. 3. *Let nothing be done through ſtrife and vain glory, but in lowlineſs of mind let each eſteem others better than themſelves.* Read this Verſe over on your Knees, and beg of God to write it on your Hearts. And I would wiſh all Aſſemblies of dividers and unwarrantable Separatiſts, to write it over the Doors of their Meeting-places, and join with it *Rom.* 12. 10. but eſpecially ſtudy *James* 3. In a word, if God would cure the Church of religious pride, the pride of wiſdom, and the pride of piety and goodneſs, the Church would have fewer hereſies and contentions, and much more peace, true wiſdome and goodneſs.

Preface to Confeſſ. The forwardneſs of many to keep open diviſions, and to affect communi-

on

on with none, but ſuch as ſay as they do, is a down-right mark of a Schiſmatick. And I know that dividing principles and diſpoſitions do tend directly to the ruine and damnation of thoſe in whom they do prevail.

When Men fall into ſeveral Parties, burning in zeal againſt each other, abating charity, cenſuring and condemning one another, backbiting and reviling each other, through envy and ſtrife; when they look ſtrangely on each other, as being of ſeveral ſides, as if they were not children of the ſame Father, nor members of the ſame Body, or as if Chriſt were divided, one being of *Paul*, and another of *Apollo*, &c. and every one of a Faction, letting out their thoughts in jealouſies and evil ſurmiſes of each other, perverting the words and actions of each to an ugly ſenſe; and ſnatching occaſions to preſent one another as fools, or odious to the hearers (as if you ſhould plainly ſay, I pray you hate, or deſpiſe theſe People, whom I hate and deſpiſe:) This is the core of the Plague ſore, it is ſchiſm in the bud. *S.* 16. When People *Chriſtian Director.* P. 734.

in the ſame Church do gather into private Meetings, not under the guidance of their Paſtors, to edifie one another in holy exerciſes, in love and peace, but in oppoſition to their lawful Paſtors, or to one another, to propagate their ſingle opinions, and increaſe their Parties, and ſpeak againſt thoſe that are not on their ſide, Schiſm is then ready to increaſe and multiply, and the Swarm is ready to come forth, and be gone. S. 17. When theſe People actually depart, and renounce or forſake the communion of the Church, and caſt off their faithful Paſtors, and draw into a ſeparated Body by themſelves, and chooſe them Paſtors, and call themſelves a Church, and all without any juſt, ſufficient cauſe; when thus Churches are gathered out of Churches, before the old ones are diſſolved, or they have any warrant to depart; when thus Paſtor is ſet up againſt Paſtor, Church againſt Church, and Altar againſt Altar, this is Schiſm ripe and fruitful, the Swarm is gone and hived in another place. S. 19. If they ſhall alſo judge that Church to be

no Church from which they ſeparated, and ſo cut off a part of the body of Chriſt by an unrighteous cenſure, and condemn the innocent, and uſurp authority over their guides; this is diſobedience and uncharitableneſs, with ſchiſm. A true Chriſtian that hateth Fornication, Drunkenneſs, Lying, Perjury, becauſe forbidden in the Word of God, will hate Diviſions alſo, which are ſo frequently and vehemently forbidden, *Jo.*17.21,22. *Ro.*14. throughout. *Ro.*15.12. 1 *Cor.* 1. 10. *Eph.* 4. 1, 2, *&c.* 1 *Cor.* 12. *Phil.*3.15. *Ro.*16.17, 18. 1 *Tim.* 1. 4. *James* 3. The miſchief of Diviſions may be ſeen at large, *p.* 739.

Q. *May, or muſt a Miniſter, ſilenced, or forbid to preach the Goſpel, go on ſtill to preach it againſt the Law? Anſw.* He that is ſilenced by juſt power, though unjuſtly, in a Country, that needeth not his preaching, muſt forbear there, and if he can, muſt go into another Country, where he may be more ſerviceable. We muſt do any lawful thing to procure the Magiſtrates licence to preach in his Dominions. *Chriſtian Direct.* p. 854.

How Humane Laws bind the Conſcience.

p. 36. part the 4th. Q. *Whether the Laws of men do bind the Conſcience?* *Anſw. p.* 37. Taking conſcience in a ſtricter ſenſe, as including eſſentially, a relation to God's obligation, the full ſenſe of the queſtion is this, *Whether it be a ſin againſt God to break the laws of man?* *Anſw.* It is a ſin againſt God to break ſuch Laws, as Rulers are authorized by God to make: Firſt, becauſe God commandeth us to obey our Rulers. God commandeth us to obey in general, and their Law determineth of the particular matter, therefore God obligeth us (in conſcience of his Law) to obey them in that particular. 2. Becauſe by making them his Officers, by his commiſſion, he hath given them a certain beam of authority, which is Divine, as derived from God; therefore they can command us by a power derived from God: therefore to diſobey is to ſin againſt a power derived from God. Man being God's officer, *firſt* his own Law layeth on us an obligati-

on

on derivatively Divine, (for it is no Law, which hath no obligation, and it is no authoritative obligation, which is not derived from God.) 2. God's own Law bindeth us to obey Man's Laws, *Romans* 13.

And it may be a good reason to perswade obedience to our Ecclesiastical Governours, because Preaching is a cheap and easie work, in comparison of Church-government. Baxter of Church Unity.

Take heed of engaging your selves in a Sect, or Faction; a narrow Sectarian separating mind will make all the truths of God give place to the opinions of his Party, and measure the prosperity of the Gospel, by the prosperity of his Party; he will not stick to persecute all the rest of the Church of Christ, if the intereſt of his Sect require it. Overvalue not any private or singular opinions of your own, or others; for, if once spiritual pride and ignorance of your own weakness make you espouse particular opinions, as peculiarly your own, you will think your conceits more illuminating and necessary, than they are, as if Mens sincerity *Christ. Direct.* part 4th. p. 73.

ty lay in the imbracing of them, and their Salvation on the receiving of them; and think all that are againſt your opinion, deſerve to be caſt out as enemies to Reformation; and perhaps, Twenty Years after, experience may bring you to your wits, and make you ſee the falſhood, or ſmalneſs of all thoſe points, which you made ſo great a matter of, and then what comfort will you have of your perſecutions?

Cure of Diviſions, p. 254.

O the deceitfulneſs of the heart of man! Little do the many real Separatiſts, who cry out againſt Perſecution, ſuſpect, that the ſame ſpirit is in them. Whence is Perſecution but from thinking ill of others, and abhorring or not loving them? and do not you do ſo by thoſe whom you cauſleſly ſeparate from? It is one and the ſame ſin in the 261. Perſecutor and Divider, or Separatiſt, which cauſeth the one to ſmite their Brethren, and the other to excommunicate them; the one to caſt them into Priſon as Schiſmaticks, and the other to caſt them out of the Church as profane; the one to account them intolerable in the Land, and the other to account

count them intolerable in the Church: the inward thoughts of both are the ſame, that thoſe whom they ſmite or ſeparate from, are bad and unlovely, and unfit for better uſage.

But I have obſerved that Profeſſors of Religion did oppoſe and deride almoſt all that worſhip of God out of (pretended) conſcience, which others did out of profaneſs. *Saints Reſt, part 1. c. 7. Sect. 14.*

It was none of the old cauſe, that the People ſhould have liberty, and the Magiſtrate ſhould have no power, in all matters of God's worſhip, faith and conſcience: And as it is not the old cauſe, ſo it is not the good cauſe. For firſt, it contradicteth the expreſs revelation of the will of God in the Holy Scripture. *Moſes*, as a Magiſtrate, had to do in matters of Religion, and ſo had the Kings of *Iſrael*, and *Judah*.---Law, and providence, are both quite changed, if toleration of falſe worſhip, and other abuſes of Religion tend not to the ruine of the Common-wealth. If Magiſtrates muſt give liberty for all to propagate a falſe religion,

H. Com. mon-wealth: Addit. to Preſ. Prop.

religion, then so must Parents and Masters also; which would be a crime so horrid in the nature and effects of it, as I am loth to name with its proper titles.

Of consir. *p.* 309. The Magistrates will quickly find that the distractions of the Church will breed and feed such distractions in the Common-wealth, as may make them wish they had quenched the fire, while it was yet quenchable. Our unity is not only our strength, but their strength; and the fire that begun in the Church, may, if let alone, reach the Court.

Pag. 403. of his 5. *Disputations*, he lays down this as the summ of what he had said, That Man may determine of modes and circumstances of Worship, necessary and commanded *in genere*, but not determined by God *in specie*, *Sect.* 65. and then infers, *Sect.* 67. If the mischoosing of such circumstances by Church-governors be but an inconvenience, and do not destroy the Ordinance it self, or frustrate the ends of it, we are to obey. 1. For he is the Judge in his own work, and not

we

we. 2. The thing is not ſinful though inconvenient. 3. Obedience is commanded to our lawful Governors. *Sect.* 70. And when we do obey in a caſe of miſcommanding, it is not a doing evil that good may come of it, as ſome do miſconceive; but it is only a ſubmitting to that which is ill-commanded, but not evil in him that doth ſubmit. It is the determiner that is the cauſe of the inconvenience, and not the obeyer. Nor is it inconvenient for me to obey, though it be worſe perhaps to him that commandeth: while he ſinneth in commanding, he may make it my duty to obey, *p.* 461. *Sect.* 6. The reaſons of this are obvious and clear, even becauſe it is the office of the Governors to determine of ſuch circumſtances. It is the Paſtor's office to guide and overſee the Flock, and when he determineth theſe, he is but in his own way, and doth but his own work; and therefore he is therein the Judge, if the caſe be controvertible. If none ſhall obey a Magiſtrate or Paſtor in the works of their own office, as long as they think he did them not

the

the beſt way, all Governours then would be preſently overthrown, and obedience denyed. We are ſure that God hath commanded us to *obey them that are over us in the Lord*, 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 12. *Hebr.* 13. 7. 17, *&c.* And therefore a certain duty may not be forborn on uncertain conjectures, or upon every miſcarriage of them that we owe it to. This would un-church all Churches (as they are Political Societies:) for if Paſtors be taken down, and the work of Paſtors, the Church is taken down. *S.* 7. And the things in which the Paſtor is now ſuppoſed to err, are not of themſelves unlawful, but only by ſuch an accident as being overweighed by another accident ſhall ceaſe to make them unlawful. For inſtance, *p.* 461. *Sect.* 4. If of two Tranſlations of Scripture or two Verſions of the Pſalms the Paſtor uſe the worſer, (ſo it be tolerable) we muſt obey. And *Sect.* 7. If the Paſtor appoint a more imperfect Verſion of the Pſalms to be ſung in the Church (as is commonly uſed in *England*) the obeying of him in the uſe of this will not bring ſo much

much hurt to the Church, as the diſobeying on that account would do. For beſides the ſin of diſobedience it ſelf, the Church would be in a confuſion if they forſake his conduct that preſerves the union; and ſome will be for this and ſome for that, and ſo the Worſhip it ſelf will be overthrown. And let it ſtill be remembred, that we allow both Magiſtrates and Paſtors to ſee to the execution of God's Laws, and to determine of circumſtances in order thereto that are neceſſary *in genere*, p. 482. *Sect.* 35. but not determined of God *in ſpecie*, p. 422. §. 65. It may be very ſinful to command ſome ceremonies which may lawfully, yea muſt in duty be uſed by the ſubject when they are commanded, *p.* 398. Certain things commonly called ceremonies may lawfully be uſed in the Church upon humane impoſition, and when it is not againſt the Law of God; no perſon ſhould diſobey the Laws of their lawful Governors in ſuch things.

If there ſhould be any Paſtors of the Churches who inſtead of concurring to *Cure of Diviſions*, p. 253.

to heal the flock of these dividing principles, shall rather joyn with backbiters and incourage them in their misreports and slanders, because it tends to the supposed interest of their party or themselves; Let them prepare to Answer such unfaithfulness to their Consciences, which will be shortly awakened; And to the great Shepherd of the flock, who is at the door, and who told even the Devils Agents that, *A house or kingdom divided against it self cannot stand, but is brought to nought.*

POSTSCRIPT.

I Have proposed such Arguments for Conformity as I occasionally met with in such books of Mr. *Baxter*'s as came to my hands. If I had consulted others, I doubt not but I might have found many more as cogent as these:

theſe: but theſe being ſatisfactory and of eternal verity, I humbly deſire Mr. *Baxter* and others of his perſwaſion to conſider them, nor can I doubt but Mr. *Baxter* will charitably accept of theſe my endeavours for peace, upon his own weighty arguments; and the rather becauſe I believe him by his writings to be a man of a great experience in the temper of the people, of a quick and diſcerning judgment, that can look through cauſes into the conſequences and effects that will naturally reſult from them, and moreover a perſon of ſo great ſincerity that he will by no means ſtray from, but readily defend his own principles, which are ſound and pacificatory. And ſeeing he hath done as St. *Paul* did, (of whom *Tertullian* notes he did perſwade to peace, *totis ſpiritûs ſancti viribus*) I believe he is one that longeth to ſee the healing of our Churches, and that tendered his Arguments to all ſorts, charging them to do ſo much as appears to be neceſſary, as they are true to Chriſt, to his Church and Goſpel, to their own and others Souls,

and

and to the peace and welfare of the nations; And as they will Answer the neglect to Christ at their peril. (In the Title of a Treatise of *Confirmation.*) And in his Answer to Dr. *Tully* (title page) A Compassionate Lamenter of the Churches wounds caused by hasty judging and undigested conceptions, and by the Theological wars which are hereby raised, and managed, by perswading the world that meer verbal, or notional differences are material, and such as our love, concord and communion must be measured by, for want of an equal discussion of the Ambiguity of words. One who (in the Epistle to the Reader for *Confirmation*) exhorts *to pray for the peace of Jerusalem, (because) they shall prosper that love it, and to seek it of God and man, which was his own daily though too defective practice, as a servant of the King of peace:* To him and all others as such I propose the following concessions, and the conclusions inferred from them.

In his *Christian Directory*, *p.* 854.

1. He that is silenced by just power though

though unjuſtly (in a Country that needeth not his preaching) muſt forbear there. And *p.* 560. of the *Saints Reſt*, he tells us as to his particular, If God would diſpenſe with me for my miniſterial ſervices without any loſs to his people, I ſhould leap as lightly as Biſhop *Ridley* when he was ſtript of his *Pontificalia*; and ſay as *Pædaretus* the *Laconian* when he was not choſen into the number of the three hundred men, I thank thee O God that thou haſt beſtowed on this City ſo many men better than my ſelf.

2. That it is lawful to hold communion with our Churches having but tolerable Paſtors, notwithſtanding the Parochial Order, and the Miniſters conformity and uſe of the Common-prayer book; And that we ought to do ſo when ſome ſpecial reaſons (as from Authority, ſcandal, *&c.*) do require it. *Second Admonition to Bagſhaw, p.* 78.

3. That when men are carried to ſeparate on ſuch (pretended) grounds, they will be no where fixt, but may ſtill be ſubdividing and ſeparating

from one another till they are resolved into Individuals, and have left no such thing as a Church among them, *p.* 486. of *the five disputations*: and *p.* 487. By disobedience in lawful things, the members of the Church will be involved in Contentions, and so ingaged in bitter uncharitableness, censures, persecutions, and reproaches of one another.

4. Though Ministerial conformity is now much altered (as to ingagements) many of the Assembly of Divines yet living do conform again, nor would I shun communion with the reverend Members of that Assembly, *Twiss*, *Gataker*, *Whitaker*, and the rest, if again they used the Liturgy among us. And if the old Non-Conformists, such as *Bolton*, *&c.* were alive, and used now the same Liturgy and Ceremonies as they did then (which was worse than now) I could not think their Communion in prayer and Sacraments unlawful, nor censure that man as injurious to the Church who should write to perswade others not to separate from them. *Defence of princi-*

principles of Love, p. 12, 13. And Mr. *Baxter's* practice in receiving the Sacrament confirmeth the ſame.

5. If any Paſtor inſtead of concurring to heal the flocks of dividing principles ſhall rather joyn with backbiters and incourage them in their miſreports and ſlanders, becauſe it tends to the ſuppoſed intereſt of their party or themſelves, let them prepare to Anſwer ſuch unfaithfulneſs to their Conſciences which will be ſhortly awakened, and to the great Shepherd of the flock who is at the door, and who told even the Devils Agents that a houſe or kingdom divided cannot ſtand. *Cf. p.* 253. *H. C.*

6. The Magiſtrate will quickly find that the diſtractions of the Church will quickly breed and feed ſuch diſtractions in the Common-wealth, as may make them wiſh they had quenched the fire while it was yet quenchable. Our unity is not only our ſtrength but their ſtrength, and the fire that begun in the Church, may, if let alone, reach the Court. *Of Confirmation, p.* 309.

Now from these premises I suppose the conclusions following may be truly inferred, a Conformity to which would be a great means to destroy Nonconformity to the Church and publick Worship, both in Ministers and people.

1. Those that are silenced by a just power (or rather have silenced themselves and uncharitably deserted the established Worship of God) ought not to gather congregations in place and manner distinct from the publick Worship, by the first proposition.

2. Communion with our Parish Churches being lawful, and the peoples duty by the second proposition, They who by such dividing practices as tend to undermine and deprave the reputation, and dissolve the very constitution of the Parochial Worship, and to encourage and harden known Schismaticks in their separation, (for if the like should be generally practised through the nation, it would inevitably scandalize the established Ministry, alienate the affections of their people, and renew divisions among them)

them) do act very irregularly and unlawfully.

3. Such practices do unfix the people and cause them to run into divisions and subdivisions, reproaches and persecutions of one another, proposition 3. And who knows into what confusions such practices may carry us?

4. Ministerial conformity being submitted to by many of the Assembly of Divines, and no sinful act required to make it unlawful (which if there had been, they or some others would and ought to have discovered it, and then I doubt not it would by Authority have been taken away, but that being not done) the Ministers ought to conform by the same rules as the people ought, which is granted by proposition 4. and confirmed by Mr. *Baxters* practice in receiving the Sacrament, &c. Such Pastors as instead of concurring to heal the flock of dividing principles, do rather joyn with backbiters and incourage them in their misreports and slanders, because it tends to the supposed interest of their party or themselves, cannot Answer

it to their Conscience nor to the great Shepherd of the flock. Propos. 5.

5. If such Minister or people do continue the distractions of the Church, it is the Magistrates duty and interest speedily to quench the fire which they are kindling, or it may ruine both Church and State. By Propos. 6.

And let Ministers see that no Seducers creep in among the people, or if they do, be diligent to countermine them and preserve their people from the infection of heresies and schisms. *Saints Rest, p.* 543.

6. Let such men consider, whether any sober, rational or good men, that have loved and followed them, can heartily respect them, or make them their Spiritual Guides, when it appears that they do ordinarily and considerately act and practise contrary to their own irrefragable arguments, protestations and perswasions.

And lastly, if such Ministers cannot fully conform themselves (which would be an acceptable service to God and the Church, (they having opportunities

cunities and advantages to add many thouſands to the publick Aſſemblies, and to confirm others that are wavering through their examples) yet that they would conform in what they may, and continue to teach by example as well as precept what may help to repair our breaches, leſt we be expoſed again to a common ruine and confuſion.

And now methinks that Summons which troubled *Quintilius Varus*, ſhould alway run in the minds of ſuch men: *Quintili Vare, redde Legiones*: you that have intruded upon the cure of Souls committed to others, reſtore thoſe Legions which are withdrawn from Chriſt's fold, and remember, (what Mr. *Baxter* ſays as to his own reputation, in a Preface to Mr. *Caryl*) *Non remittitur peccatum, niſi reſtituatur ablatum.*

Calvin's Epiſtle before the *Geneva* Catechiſm: *Ubi ad ſummum illud tribunal ventum fuerit, &c.* When we ſhall come to that great tribunal where we are to render an account of our Miniſtry,

ſtry, there ſhall be no queſtion concerning Ceremonies, neither ſhall this conformity in outward things be brought to examination, but the lawful uſe of our liberty, and that ſhall be adjudged lawful that conduceth moſt to edification.

FINIS.